

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.
The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Twelve, 26s., Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.

* We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.
Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publishers.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH, 21, 1874.

IT IS ANNOUNCED that the Benchers of Gray's Inn have resolved to institute an inquiry into Dr. Keenale's conduct "during and with reference to the trial of the Claimant," and that they have appointed a committee to report upon the charges which, in their opinion, Dr. Keenale should be called upon to answer. We do not wish to discuss the propriety of the course thus taken, but we cannot refrain from protesting against the strange assumption which seems to be made in some quarters that because the judges in the course of the recent trial expressed an opinion that an advocate had abused his privileges, the Benchers of his Inn are bound to institute an inquiry. The opinion of a judge as to the conduct of an advocate must always command attention, but to suppose, as the *Pall Mall Gazette* appears to suppose, that the fact of "three judges and a jury" censuring an advocate makes it "the duty of his Inn to inquire into his conduct," is to convert the Benchers into mere henchmen of the judges, and to place in the hands of the latter a most crushing weapon against an obnoxious advocate—the power of virtually ordering an "inquiry." We need add nothing here to what we have said in another column as to the importance of upholding the independence of the Bar. Another matter, in our opinion, calling for even more emphatic protest, is the system adopted by the above-mentioned newspaper of goading the Benchers to action against Dr. Keenale. The benevolent anxiety of this very impartial journal for the honour of the learned counsel, and of the Benchers, and of the Bar, is touching, but it might, perhaps, with advantage, be accompanied with some perception of the fact that all these persons are perfectly able to defend their own honour without the assistance of any journalist.

A NOVEL PRINCIPLE of disqualification, and one to which we cannot too earnestly call the attention of the profession, has been recently propounded under apparently high authority. At the late election for the University of Dublin, consequent upon the acceptance by Dr. Ball of the office of Attorney-General for Ireland, one junior fellow of Trinity College proposed, and another seconded, a third junior fellow, as a candidate for election, upon the principle of "Disestablishment of Lawyers." If the rev. medico who opened this question is to be believed, Irish lawyers live only for the purpose of feeding upon the Government of the day, and the Irish clergy have no greater happiness than to supply them with a passport to office, from which he somewhat amusingly argues that to be a fitting representative of the University it is necessary to be a Fellow and an M.D. (these classes being of course exempt from the frailties which so beset the other learned professions). With the personal questions thus introduced we have no intention to meddle, though we entirely disclaim any concurrence in the imputations so recklessly thrown out by Dr. Haughton; but the

general question raised is one of public importance, and seems to us to call for some remark.

The prejudice against lawyers is nothing new, nor has it become more reasonable by lapse of time. We have all heard of the "*Parliamentum indoctum*," from which all lawyers were excluded, and which Lord Coke dismisses with the remark, "Never a good law was made thereat."

From that day to this the lawyers have been from time to time made the butts of meagre witticisms, and occasionally the victims of the same persistent prejudice. And yet upon their honesty, skill, and fidelity, all the most important interests throughout the kingdom mainly depend. The very men who chatter obscure calumnies against lawyers as a body, are compelled to confide, and do undoubtedly and safely confide, their characters, their property, the honour of their families, and, very often, secrets which they scarcely like to acknowledge to themselves, to the keeping of their legal advisers. One would imagine that those who habitually prove themselves worthy of so high a trust can hardly be so unworthy of public confidence as the college trio (emulous, apparently, of the fame of their prototypes of Tooley-street) would have the world believe.

But, further, not only is there no case made for the "disestablishment" of lawyers, but the exigencies of the public service imperatively demand their establishment. Anyone who has taken the trouble to follow the course of legislation, particularly in the House of Commons, can hardly fail to have been struck by the manner in which the whole House, with exceptions so few as to be inconsiderable, leaves all the practical details of legislation in the hands of the lawyers. The House at large may join in a debate on a question of general interest or public policy, but when the second reading has been passed, and the Bill has to be put into a workable form in Committee, it is upon the lawyers that all the real work falls, and those few lay members who occasionally try their hand at an amendment find the House but too ready to accept the offhand statement of some practical lawyer that the clause "wouldn't work" as an amply sufficient reason for refusing even to consider the question. And we must own that the constituencies at large show themselves fully alive to this consideration, and generally give a lawyer, *ceteris paribus*, the preference.

But there is a further ground on which it seems to us that lawyers are peculiarly appropriate representatives of a University. As the county members are properly chosen from the owners of property who have great local interests, and the representatives of commerce and industry are naturally found in the members for great towns, so the distinctly "educated" element in society finds its appropriate entrance into Parliament through the universities. Of this element one principal, though not by any means exclusive, test is academical distinction; and it is perhaps not too much to say that no such constituency can safely, except in the case of rare eminence in after life, dispense with this qualification in a candidate for their suffrages. But the most distinguished students of every university are found, with trifling exceptions, in the ranks of the clergy or the bar; and as the former are disqualified by law from sitting in the House of Commons, the choice of the electors is almost of necessity limited to the latter. Here and there a physician of distinction may be found who could worthily, so far as professional eminence goes, fill this post; but the training of his life, which more or less secludes him from the arena of wordy contest, is not usually of a kind to fit him to take the lead in debate which ought to be required from the representative of a University. Such cases as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Beresford Hope are no real exceptions to this rule; brilliant scholars of the highest academical distinction, who are able at once to devote themselves to political life, and who, after winning their spurs as members for less important constituencies, are called upon to receive their reward at the

hands of their Universities, constitute a class always rare, and whose position is entirely exceptional. And it is worthy of remark that certainly one (we believe both) of the gentlemen named had entered upon a course of training for the bar.

Lastly, in this case *res ipsa loquitur*: anyone who will look down the list of the representatives of any University in the kingdom for the last seventy years will, if he has any acquaintance with the modern history of his country, be struck by three reflections: one, how very large a proportion of these representatives have left their mark upon the legislation of the age; another, with how few exceptions they have been selected from the ranks of the lawyers; and the last, that, except in one or two remarkable instances, the undistinguished minority includes all the non-lawyers.

WHAT IS THE EFFECT which some of our contemporaries think likely to be produced from the publication of assertions made about the Tichborne Case by members of the Orton family and others? And who are the persons thought to be likely to feel such effect? Out of Bedlam, or more appropriately, perhaps, out of Earlwood, we should have thought that it would be difficult to find readers so fatuous as to give any weight to, or feel any interest in, these dreary, cooked-up utterances. It is certainly not our wish to add to the intermittent reverberations with which the great storm is drawing off; and it is, perhaps, hardly worth while to protest against any of the immediate results of so exceptional a trial, especially as it is every day growing clearer that its true function in the history of our law must be that of an awful warning, and by no means that of a useful precedent. At the same time, a very few words may not be out of place in this journal to protest against any possible repetition in other cases of the course of action to which we have alluded. It is clearly of the greatest importance that the prevailing impression on the mind of the public should be, that in the vast majority of instances criminal trials end in the release of the innocent, or the punishment of the guilty; and, consequently, whoever, without some good and sufficient motive, assists in destroying or weakening this impression, commits an offence against the public welfare. It is, perhaps, not quite in the fashion of these times to assume that any one acts from motives of high public spirit; but it is certainly quite in the fashion to take for granted that everybody is possessed of the nicest good taste. Appealing, therefore, to the well-known good taste of our contemporaries, we entreat them to pause before, at the close of, say, the next great murder case, they fill their columns with unsworn testimony for and against the correctness of the result at which the jury may have arrived.

WE REFERRED some time ago to the manner in which the marginal notes to Acts of Parliament have been abridged to mere indexes. Upon looking through modern statutes we find that their preambles also are becoming more and more diminished, and are in some cases altogether omitted. The Education Act of 1870, for instance, has none, nor the Trades Union Act of 1871, nor the Public Health Act, 1872, nor the Regulation of Railways Act, 1873. We are no advocates of lengthy preambles, and there is the high authority of Bacon against them, but it must be remembered that he lived in an age when it was the fashion to preface legislation by such copybook texts as that "truth (being of her own nature of a most excellent . . . working) cannot but by process of time break out and show herself, howsoever for a while she may be by the iniquity of man be suppressed and kept close" (1 Ma. Sess. 2, cap. 1). A preamble, though of slight value for the purpose of construction, may often materially assist the lawyer by gathering together former statutes proposed to be affected, or by using language of reference to some decided case which made legislation necessary, and the re-

port of which will often be found to contain the whole previous statute and case law of the subject. Suppose, for instance, that it be thought necessary this session to legislate in consequence of the decision in *Ramsden v. Lupton* (22 W. R. 129). To frame a preamble referring to that decision would, we imagine, be as useful as it would be easy.

THE LAST BATCH of Queen's Counsel are all of the Common Law Bar, and, with one exception, members of the Home Circuit. We understand that it is not intended at present to add to the number of silk gowns at the Equity Bar. The following is a list of the new Queen's Counsel, with their respective dates of call:—

One member of the Midland Circuit, Mr. Edward Henry Pember (Hilary Term, 1858). Four members of the Home Circuit, Mr. P. C. Gates (Michaelmas Term, 1850), Mr. F. A. Inderwick (Hilary Term, 1858), Mr. Frederick Adolphus Philbrick (Trinity Term, 1860), and Mr. George Parker Bidder (Michaelmas Term, 1860).

THE COMING JUDICATURE BILL FOR IRELAND.

At the opening of Parliament for business on Thursday last, the Queen's Message contained the following passage:—

"You will probably be of opinion that the rearrangement of the judicature, and the blending of the administration of law and equity, which were effected for England by the enactment of last session, ought, on the same principles, to be extended to Ireland, and you will be asked to devote some part of your time to the accomplishment of this object."

The details of the measure thus indicated are probably not yet finally settled, and therefore any remarks we may now make must necessarily be confined to the more salient aspects of the question.

We assume that no attempt is to be made to revise or continue the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords. Not only would it be, under any circumstances, hopeless to expect to retrace the step made last year almost without a dissentient voice, but the difficulty would, in this particular instance, be aggravated by the fact that the present Lord Chancellor, although, in 1872, he successfully resisted the transfer of jurisdiction then attempted, last year altogether withdrew his opposition to this part of the measure, and confined his attention to certain other questions, of great importance indeed, but not affecting the constitution of the proposed Court of Final Appeal. This view is confirmed by the words "on the same principles" which occur in the Queen's Message, and which we read as intended to negative any notion that the retention of this jurisdiction by the House of Lords could be regarded as an open question.

We trust, however, that this adoption of the principles of the Act of last year will not be followed far into detail. The principal point of contention, indeed, upon which discussion raged so hotly last year, can hardly arise again now, because at the Irish Bar the separation between Chancery and Common Law is far from being so complete and marked as it is in England. And if this be true of the Irish Bar it is still more so of the Irish Bench. The annals of the Irish Bar can point to no more distinguished equity counsel, and we may add to no one whose distinction lay more exclusively in courts of equity, than Baron Fitzgerald; nor could a much more marked example of success *utroque jure* be easily found than Baron Deasy. Lord Justice Christian too, whose eloquent panegyric on Equity is fresh in the minds of us all, was for several years a Justice of the Common Pleas; whilst Lord Commissioner Lawson has proved, by the experience of the last five years, that the due performance of the duties of a Common Law judge is a sequel not inconsistent with a life spent in the atmosphere of the Court of Chancery. On the other hand, for it would be an utter mistake to suppose that this "ambi-dexterity" is peculiar to the

equity lawyers, no more successful Master of the Rolls has for many years been known than the brilliant Nisi Prius advocate, Mr. Serjeant Sullivan. Hence it follows that, whether an intermixture of Equity and Common Law lawyers in each Division be *a priori* desirable or not, in Ireland it will be found ready made, and no question can arise upon the point. The arrangement of the High Court of Justice for Ireland would, therefore, seem to present little or no difficulty. By attaching the judges of the Landed Estates Court and Probate Court to the Chancery Division, and making due provision for the absorption of the judges of the Bankruptcy Court as occasion may arise, a good permanent court, containing four divisions of four judges each, would be constituted, which would be amply sufficient for all the judicial business of the country, at any rate so long as the cases under the Land Act are left within the jurisdiction of the county chairmen. But when we come to deal with the question of appeal, the case is completely altered, and we find ourselves confronted, not merely by the difficulties which surrounded this question as it affected England, but by others of no less magnitude peculiar to the position of Ireland.

We have never disguised our opinion that the abolition of an intermediate appeal, even for England, was a fatal mistake; and we hope that the expected and almost promised amendment Act will, in some form or other, restore this right; but in the case of Ireland a power of double appeal is not merely desirable, but essential. All the arguments in favour of a ready means of correcting the errors of the Courts of First Instance are cogent to require a Court of Appeal upon the spot; whilst every danger arising from the divergences of our law, every argument in favour of the unity of our jurisprudence, forbids us to contemplate the possibility of a final Court of Appeal for any part of the empire situate elsewhere than in London.

For the practical work of the judiciary a ready means of appeal is required, not only because you cannot expect the unsuccessful suitor to rest satisfied without a second opinion in very numerous instances (and it is of the essence of a good judicial system to give general satisfaction), but also because the knowledge that an appeal lies "at the door" is of the greatest utility in curbing the exuberance of judicial idiosyncracies among the judges of first instance. An appeal which had to be prosecuted in another country, with different counsel and solicitors, after long delays, and at considerable expense, would not meet the demand, and thus the removal from Dublin of the courts of first appeal would create an evil infinitely greater than any which the bill is intended to obviate. On the other hand, there must always be a *residuum* of cases of great difficulty or importance, which demand more careful examination, and will bear more expensive treatment, than the ordinary run of cases will admit of, and these naturally become, at least under our system of "judge-made law," the land-marks for future guidance. When such cases have been subjected to the scrutiny of an ultimate Court of Appeal, deciding upon them after ample, even excessive, discussion, composed itself of an adequate number of the most distinguished lawyers of the day, and attracting to its bar all the foremost advocates in the profession, no court, not even the one by whose authority they have been decided, ever hesitates to accept the judgment as conclusive of the law. But for this purpose the court must be essentially Imperial—if it be practically a provincial court, call it by what name you will, it will never have more than a limited authority, even in the province over which its jurisdiction extends—and an Imperial Court can sit nowhere except at the seat of Government.

But the retention of this double appeal for Ireland—and the same remarks are equally applicable to the case of Scotland—bids fair to produce some noticeable complications if the scheme of a single appeal for England be persevered in.

(To be continued.)

THE DOMESTIC DISCIPLINE OF THE INNS OF COURT.

In our remarks upon this subject (*ante* p. 338) we arrived at the conclusion that the real question, or questions, for determination were—1st, whether it is or not desirable that barristers in actual practice should be subjected to any authority other than that of the judges; and 2ndly, if so, whether any and what authority better than that of the benchers of the several Inns of Court can be devised for the purpose?

To the former of these questions we have no hesitation in giving an affirmative answer. The position of an advocate is one of peculiar difficulty and responsibility, requiring for the due discharge of its duties widely differing, and to some extent antagonistic, qualifications. The most prominent of these, though not, perhaps, the most important, is independence. Unless an advocate is so secure of his position that he can venture to withstand, without fear, the adverse criticisms, and even the active opposition, of the tribunal before which he is engaged, the danger of miscarriage of justice arising from prejudice, caprice, or infirmity on the part of the judge, already formidable enough, would be largely and alarmingly increased. Even as it is, with the perfect knowledge that (in the absence of actual contempt of Court) he is entitled to say, and the judge *must* listen to, anything, however extravagant, which he may think it for the interest of his client to say, we not unfrequently find, even in counsel of the highest position, a disposition to defer to the weaknesses or prejudices of judges with whom they are much brought into contact. A somewhat ludicrous story went the round of Lincoln's Inn a few weeks ago, attributing to a very leading advocate such terror of the judge that he did not venture to argue his case. This was, of course, an absurd exaggeration, but it pointed to a danger which even now is very real, and which a very slight increase in the direct action of the judges upon the Bar would dangerously augment.

But another qualification requisite for an advocate, of an importance even greater, if possible, than independence, is honour. The double relation in which an advocate stands, to his client and to the public, places him not seldom in a position of peculiar difficulty and it would not be easy to overstate the strength of the temptation to which he is frequently exposed, to abuse this relation in one direction or the other; to abandon a client against whose case a strong prejudice exists, or to misrepresent or improperly suppress facts within his knowledge which he finds it inconvenient to meet. Moreover, the course of business imperatively requires that arrangements made between counsel for opposing parties, frequently without any written evidence, generally informal, and sometimes imperfect in detail, should be carried out *uberrimâ fide*; and upon the strict performance of their engagements in this respect by the advocates employed, judges, solicitors, and parties are constantly compelled to rely as the sole available guaranty for the due administration of justice. This consideration is indeed also applicable to the solicitors of the parties, but not to the same extent; 1st, because arrangements between them are generally made in writing and with deliberation, whereas arrangements between counsel are usually made in court, in the course of the conduct of a cause, and frequently either without any writing or with at most a mere note of the principal points agreed upon; 2ndly, because the law implies an unlimited authority to counsel and solicitors to bind their clients by agreements made in court (and these, as we have seen, are generally made by counsel), whereas no such authority will be implied in the case of arrangements *out of court*. This distinction does not depend on the person by whom the arrangement is made, but solely upon the question whether it is or not embodied in an order or rule. Thus, in *Green v. Crockett* (13 W. R. 1052), the Court refused to enforce a compromise

deliberately come to by the leading counsel on both sides, although they had been expressly authorised to settle the case, and the terms of compromise had been carefully discussed and agreed to and embodied in a document signed by them both, one of the parties having afterwards refused to carry out the agreement; while in *The North West of Ireland Deep Sea Fishery Company* (16 Mar., 1871) Bacon, V.C., refused to allow the parties to recede from an agreement made by a junior counsel on his own judgment, and without express authority, on which an order of Court had been made, although it was immediately repudiated by their solicitor even before the order had been drawn up.

The enormous power thus confided to counsel demands corresponding responsibility; and the inevitable weakness of human nature requires that this responsibility should not be of mere imperfect obligation, and therefore that there should be some authority capable of enforcing it; even, if necessary, to the extent of depriving the offender of the power of offending again by removing him from the practice of his profession. We have already given our reasons for holding that this authority ought not to be entrusted to the judges, and it follows that some other body must be found for the exercise of this function.

The second question, whether any better authority than the benchers of the several Inns of Court can be devised for this purpose, does not admit of so simple a reply.

The peculiarity of such a body is that it must necessarily exercise its authority in a manner essentially different from, and more arbitrary than, the ordinary course of Courts of Justice; it has to deal with questions of honour and conduct with respect to which no hard and fast rules can be laid down; it has to give due weight to many considerations, whether of aggravation or palliation, which would, in a purely judicial point of view, be simply irrelevant; and it is not only entitled, but bound, to consider the practical consequences of its decisions on persons not directly before it, who could not be regarded at all in any strictly legal proceeding. The proper exercise of such an authority obviously requires very special qualifications in those to whom it is entrusted. Their class sympathies must, at least to a considerable extent, be similar to those of the subjects of their control; for otherwise they will be incapable of duly entering into the numerous refined considerations above referred to, and will, dealing with such questions from an *extern* point of view, be liable to continual misunderstanding. The failure of all attempts to create satisfactory courts of arbitration between capital and labour is an apt illustration of this difficulty. On this account it is that nobody appointed by the Crown, however otherwise fitted for the task, could be entrusted with this authority; it must be a body deriving its jurisdiction from within, and enforcing its decrees as much from the respect freely accorded to its *personnel*, as from any official or coercive powers which it may possess. On the other hand, it must be above all suspicion of professional jealousy. Nothing could be more destructive of the efficiency of any such body than any widespread idea, however unfounded, that the members were actuated by any motives of personal advantage in censuring or degrading a professional rival, or were open to any personal inducements to bias their course in any particular case. They ought not therefore to be subject to anything in the nature of *election*; nor ought they to hold their position upon any uncertain or fluctuating tenure. The case of the Illinois farmers well illustrates the evils attendant upon election to judicial or quasi-judicial posts; and there can be no doubt that, as the time of termination of their tenure of office drew nigh, many of those who ought to hold an even hand, in any case of alleged delinquency, between the offender, the profession, and the public, would be unduly swayed by the obvious consideration that upon their action then might hang the fate of their coming re-election. Nor could this

objection be avoided, nay rather it would be increased, by making the appointment nominative: the persons to be conciliated would indeed be changed, but their number would be diminished, and with it the chance of counterbalancing influences; so that the candidate for re-appointment would be even more exposed to the bias objected to than if his office depended upon the choice of a wider constituency. The persons, then, to be intrusted with the discipline of the bar must, we conclude, be, 1st, wholly or principally practising barristers; 2ndly, sufficiently advanced in professional estimation to be above all suspicion of acting from fear, deference, jealousy, or personal motives of any kind, in the case of any person, of whatever position in the profession, whose case might be brought before them; and, 3rdly, holding office either for life or for a fixed term of years, and, in the latter case, without being eligible for re-appointment. These conditions are, indeed, all satisfied by the existing authority, the Benchers of the several Inns, and therefore, if the only question for consideration were whether any case has been made for the substitution of some other authority on the ground of any incapacity or unfitness of the Benchers for the office, we should feel bound to answer in the negative.

But this seems to us not to be enough: if there can be suggested any other body (existing or readily capable of being called into existence) which should possess all the essential qualifications above pointed out, and be free from specific objections which have been taken to the constitution of the Benchers of the Inns, a case will, we think, have been made out for transferring the authority now vested in the Benchers to the body thus qualified. It is, however, essential to the validity of this proposition that the proposed new body should be readily attainable, and that there should be good reasons for anticipating that the exercise of this authority by them will practically work better than the existing system, not merely from theoretical superiority in their constitution, but upon grounds which appeal to every-day experience and common sense.

We believe that such a body could, without any very violent departure from existing circumstances, be easily and conveniently created; and, moreover, that there are sufficient grounds for believing that it will possess all the advantages, and not be open to all the objections, which can be urged for and against the present system.

What this body is, how to be constituted, and why we consider it entitled to supersede the action of the Benchers, we will explain at length at a future opportunity.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

COVENANTS IN MARRIAGE SETTLEMENTS AS TO FUTURE-ACQUIRED PROPERTY.

Re Edwards, L.J.J., 22 W. R. 144, L. R. 9 Ch. 97.

Alleyne v. Hussen, V.C.H., 22 W. R. 203.

The principal object of the ordinary covenant in marriage settlements relating to the settlement of property subsequently coming to the wife, or the husband in her right, is to exclude the marital right, and it therefore seems reasonable to presume that where the words "during the coverture" are omitted, it is intended to operate only upon property coming to the wife during the marriage. But in *Stevens v. Van Voorst* (17 Beav. 305, 308), the late Master of the Rolls, reversing this presumption, seems to have thought that it needed some express words to restrict the covenant to property acquired during the coverture. In *Re Edwards*, however, the Lords Justices (having consulted the Lord Chancellor) held that in the absence of any expressions showing that a covenant of this nature was intended to have a more extended operation, it is to be construed as if the usual words "during the said intended coverture"

had been inserted. It may be noticed that in *Carter v. Carter* (L. R. 8 Eq. 551) Malins, V.C., held that words in the covenant directing that it should take effect if the wife, her executors or administrators, or the husband, his executors or administrators, in right of his wife, became at any time after marriage entitled to any real or personal estate, would not carry the operation of the covenant beyond the coverture. In *Alleyne v. Hussey* the words in the covenant, "at any time hereafter," were held to be equally ineffectual for this purpose.

COMMON LAW.

POOR RATE—RAILWAY RATING.

Reg. v. London and North Western Railway Company, Q.B., 22 W. R. 263, L. R. 9 Q. B. 134.

This decision carries the rule as to enhancement of value by collateral circumstances to an extent the propriety of which may be doubtful. The property to be rated was a branch line which the appellants, the railway company, owned, and which they used for feeding their main line, but which other companies might, if they had owned it, have used for feeding theirs. It was thus an object in the possession of the defendants, and an object of desire to the other companies, and would have been, if in the market, an object of competition among them all. On this ground it was sought to apply what may be termed the test of hypothetical competition, and to say that, because the line was so situated that it would confer corresponding advantages on whichever of the companies possessed it, its value should be taken as enhanced by the circumstance that their competition would raise the hypothetical rent. Now, railways are rated according to a calculation of their actual earnings, by reason of the impossibility of ascertaining their value otherwise. Further, it has been long established that in each parish they must be rated according to the earnings in that parish, and not on a principle of general mileage rating; the amount earned in the parish being determined by the fare paid in respect of the transit through it, with certain deductions. The adjustment is the subject of an elaborate calculation, which need not be here considered. It was further determined in *Great Eastern Railway Company v. Haughley* (14 W. R. 779, L. R. 1 Q. B. 666) that what is called contributive value is not to be taken into account; that is, that a portion of the line is not to be rated more highly because of its assisting to bring traffic on to another part of the line; nor, on the other hand, are the expenses of one part of the line to be taken at a less rate because of their being incurred partly for the sake of the traffic over another part of the line. In the present case, according to the usual practice of competing companies, the appellants, for the purpose of bringing traffic on to their own line, were in the habit of charging to persons using the branch line as part of their through system no higher fares than would be paid by them if they travelled on any of the competing lines, though travelling over a greater distance, thus, in effect, taking sometimes nothing, and sometimes less than the regular branch fare for their use of the branch line, and contenting themselves, as to such passengers, with the profit that remained to them upon the through fare. Now, it was admitted on the argument that, on the principle of *Great Eastern Railway Company v. Haughley*, the branch line must be taken by itself, and that its actual earnings could not be increased by adding the earnings on the through line, nor, on the other hand, the expenses to be deducted diminished by attributing them to the through line. But it was contended that the position of the branch as an object of hypothetical competition enhanced its value; and on the hearing of the appeal, not only had this contention been raised, but the respondents had also contended for the allocation to the branch line of so much of the through fares as would be equivalent to the

usual fares for the part of the branch travelled over by the through passengers (which, as we have before stated, was abandoned on the argument), and the sessions had dismissed the appeal and confirmed the rate, in case either of the above contentions of the respondents was correct, thus plainly showing that, in their judgment, the enhancement was to be measured by the very same rule as was sought to be applied by the other contention. The Court of Queen's Bench decided that this enhancement is to be taken into account, and confirmed the order of sessions. Now, in calculating the earnings in any particular parish on a line, the mileage principle must necessarily be so far applied as to give to the parish a proportion of every through fare corresponding with the distance travelled in the parish, so that if a passenger travelling one hundred miles goes for ten miles of his journey through the parish, one-tenth of his fare (after the usual deductions) must be appropriated to that parish. Thus the fare by the branch and the through line must be spread over the whole distance, and less per mile will be earned by it, both on the branch and on the through line, than by the ordinary fare on each. That this distribution of the fare cannot be changed, by giving the branch its usual fare and the main line the residue, was admitted and was agreed by the Court, from which it follows that the main line must continue to pay on the usual footing. But it was in effect held that the branch must pay on the alleged enhancement at the same rate as if the distribution had been so changed. It follows from this that the railway company will pay on more than its earnings, for it will pay on the main line as if the fare were a through fare, and on the branch as if it were a branch fare; that is, it will pay altogether as if the fare were greater than it is. But why? Because, if the branch were in the market, other people would bid for it. But if they did bid for it, and got it, what would they do with it? It is admitted that they would do exactly what the present owners do; that is, to get the margin of profit on their through line they would, in effect, remit the whole or a part of the branch fare to through travellers. But was it shown that if they did so they would earn a greater profit than the present company, so as to be able to pay a greater rent? Not at all. How, then, would their competition affect the rent? And how by possibility could the enhancement by competition amount to the whole of the remitted fares, when whoever had it must, for the purpose of getting the margin of profit, remit the fares? The cases referred to by the Court seem in no way to support their decision. In the case of the canteen (*R. v. Bradford*, 4 M. & S. 317) there was a special and exclusive right annexed to the place. In *Allison v. Monkwearmouth Shore* (4 E. & B. 13) the owner of the brewery rated had the power of compelling the tenants of public-houses to take their beer of him, and paid on a value enhanced by this circumstance. But what was rated in one place was not rated in another; the public-houses under obligation were worth the less for that reason; for it must necessarily be, and it is a well-known fact, that a free public-house commands a higher rent than one which is not free. But here the railway company will be taxed for the same thing in two places. We do not see how the present case is consistent with the fair application of *Great Eastern Railway Company v. Haughley*, and it has very much the appearance of being an attempt to overrule it.

INCLOSURE—COMMON.

Musgrave v. The Inclosure Commissioners, Q.B., 22 W. R. 295.

The odd feature of this case is that it seems indistinguishable from *Lloyd v. Earl Powis* (4 E. & B. 485), but that neither was that case cited, nor in that case was the section of the statute on which the present case was decided in any way referred to. The question shortly was, whether, under the Inclosure Act, 8 & 9 Vict. c. 118, the lord of the

inclosed waste was entitled to an allotment in respect of a common of pasture, used or exercised by him in respect of lands which formed part of the manor. In *Lloyd v. Earl Powis* the question was, in substance, the same, the only difference in the facts being that instead of the lands having always formed part of the demesne of the manor (as in the present case, and in *Arundell v. Lord Falmouth*, cited below), they had been purchased by Earl Powis, and that afterwards the legal right of common was extinguished by the manor descending to him. In that case the 54th section of the Act was referred to, which provides that "where any claim shall be made to any right of common or other right which . . . could not be sustained in law, but proof shall be given to the satisfaction of the valuer or of the Commissioners or assistant Commissioner, that there has been enjoyment under the right so claimed for the space of sixty years or upwards, next before the first meeting . . . it shall be lawful for the valuer, &c., to allow such claims in such and the same manner as if the right so claimed might have been legally sustained and established." These words seemed expressly designed to meet the case, and to preclude any such difficulty as arose in *Arundell v. Lord Falmouth* (2 M. & S. 440), where on much more doubtful words the same conclusion was arrived at. However section 54, though referred to, was not relied upon; but upon the authority of *Arundell v. Lord Falmouth*, it was held that the lord was entitled to an allotment in respect of this *quasi* right or usage of common. In the present case, however, neither section 54 nor *Lloyd v. Earl Powis* was cited, but the case was determined on the language of section 27, by which, in their provisional order, the Commissioners are to set forth on what "terms and conditions" the inclosure should be made, and the proportion of land which should be allotted to the lord in respect of his right and interest in the soil, "either exclusively or inclusively of . . . any right of pasturage which may have been usually enjoyed by such lord or his tenants, or any other right or interest of such lord in the land to be inclosed." The same conclusion being reached by two wholly independent routes, there can hardly remain any doubt of its correctness.

MINES—SURFACE—WATER.

Dumbell v. Bellacorkish Mining Company, P.C.,
22 W. R. 277.

An Act of Tynwald assured to the tenants in the Isle of Man their lands, and reserved to the lord the mines. It was held that there was nothing in this to qualify the ordinary right of a mine owner to work his mines, without being liable to the owner of the surface for the loss of water caused by mining operations, not interfering with any defined watercourse, that is in effect, for the loss of percolating water. As we cannot understand on what grounds the opposite construction was based (except so far as related to a custom as to compensation, the proof of which wholly failed), it will be sufficient to notice the fact of the decision, notwithstanding the very lengthy judgment in which (after the manner of modern judges) it is expressed.

Mr. George Russell, county court judge of circuit No. 19, sat at Derby for the last time on Saturday afternoon. The learned gentleman was appointed to the district in 1866, and within the last few days he has been transferred to the Kent district, in place of Mr. Scott, who has lately died. It being known that Mr. Russell was to take his farewell, practitioners from all the different courts in his district were present, and at the conclusion of the ordinary business of the day, Mr. Samuel Leech, ex-mayor of Derby, addressed Mr. Russell in eloquent terms. Every one, he said, seemed to be losing a much-valued personal friend. He referred to Mr. Russell's legal knowledge and clear mind, but especially remarked upon the kindness and consideration he had shown to every class of suitors. Mr. Russell, who seemed much affected by the feeling manifested towards him, briefly expressed his gratitude.

REVIEWS.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

The Law and Practice in Bankruptcy: under the Provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71; the Debtors' Act, 1869, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 62; and the Bankruptcy Repeal and Insolvent Court Act, 1869, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 38; and the Cases and Decisions of all the Courts down to the present time. By A. A. DORIA, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq., B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law. Horace Cox. 1874.

This book is a kind of rehabilitation of the work on bankruptcy written by Messrs. Doria and Macrae before the recent changes in the law on the subject. It has an advantage over its predecessor in being comprised in one volume only, while the small, handy shape of the old work is preserved in its successor. The type is good and clear; and the index, so far as we have been able to examine it, is tolerably full and sufficient.

The book itself consists of over a thousand pages, to which are prefixed 115 pages purporting to give the "cases decided during the progress of the work through the press," a description to which Mr. Doria seems inclined to give rather a liberal construction. It is a serious drawback to this part of the work that there is no index of subjects to the matters treated of in the recent cases, while the formal headings, under which these cases are grouped, are by no means always safe guides to what is placed under them, so that, without going through the 115 supplementary pages, a person using the book can never be quite satisfied that the doctrines laid down in what we may call the book proper have not been seriously modified since the cases there cited.

The general character of the book is that of an array of headnotes of cases. The cases seem all to be treated as of equal and binding authority; and, so far as we have been able to examine the book, the author seldom ventures into generalisation, and never into the discussion of points certain to arise but not yet decided. Matters of the greatest importance are skimmed over with a word or two. For example, the vexed question of what is the extent of the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court over third persons is very inadequately treated, although the author had the great advantage over preceding text-writers of having before him the case of *Ellis v. Silber* (21 W. R. 346, L. R. 8 Ch. 83). No opinion seems to be given on the question whether a woman married since the Married Women's Property Act, 1870, can be made a bankrupt in respect of debts incurred by her before her marriage. We recently referred to this question (*ante* p. 316) in noticing the case of *Re Heneage*, and in March of last year we reported a decision of a county court judge on the point (*Re Philips*, 17 S. J. 385). Again, we have looked in vain for any suggestions on the true effect of the Bankruptcy Act, as respects the ultimate right to the proceeds of a sale by the sheriff at the instance of a creditor whose debt exceeds £50. In this, as in many other points on which we have consulted Mr. Doria's book, it shows to considerable disadvantage besides Mr. Robson's work, the latter having, at page 301, anticipated the recent judgment of Mellish, L.J., on the point we have just mentioned, in *Ex parte Villars, In re Rogers* (22 W. R. 397) on which we commented *ante* p. 315. We abstain from noticing in detail all the points we have searched the book upon, and in respect of which we have found it more or less disappointing. As a short guide to the cases it may be found of service, but in our opinion it cannot rank with thoughtful, systematic text-books.

THE REVISED STATUTES.

The Statutes. Revised Edition. Vol. 5. By Authority. Eyre & Spottiswoode.

This handsome volume contains the existing Statutes from 52 Geo. 3 to 4 Geo. 4 (1812 to 1823), which occupy

more than four of the volumes of the quarto edition of the Statutes. The progress which is being made in the publication of the work is very satisfactory, and gives us reason to hope that the last volume of the long series yet to come may see the light during the lifetime of the present generation of lawyers.

NOTES.

Yesterday Mellish, L.J., affirmed the decision of Mr. Registrar Spring-Rice in *Re Fastnedge*, to the effect that money secured to a bankrupt by a banker's "marginal note," but which did not become actually payable until after the commencement of the bankruptcy, was not within the "order and disposition clause" (section 15, sub-section 5) of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and that consequently, when the money became payable, the bankrupt's assignee for value was entitled to it in preference to the general body of the creditors. On the same day James, L.J., affirmed the decision of the Chief Judge in *Re Keyworth* (22 W. R. 350).

The Rochdale and Oldham tradespeople continue their crusade against Mr. Crompton Hutton. On Tuesday last an adjourned meeting was held at Manchester, at which the following letter from Mr. Hutton was read:—"Sir,—In answer to your letter of yesterday, I beg to state that I should not consider it right to attend a meeting for the discussion of matters decided by me judicially, and must decline to do so. I may state for your information that the law relating to the class of cases to which you refer is to be found in *Jolly v. Rees* (12 W. R. 473)." A gentleman promptly remarked that on looking at the case he at once saw that it was not "on all fours" with the class of cases under consideration. It was moved "that a case should be appealed to one of the superior courts," but it was suggested that instead of taking a case to a superior court complaint should be made direct to the Lord Chancellor, and an amendment was ultimately carried in favour of an interview with the Lord Chancellor as to Mr. Hutton's decisions. We shall look with interest for the result of this novel mode of appeal.

The important case of *Ex parte Villars*, 22 W. R. 397, on which we commented *ante* p. 315, is to be reheard by the Full Court of Appeal, the first day of Easter Term being fixed for that purpose. This course has been adopted at the suggestion of the Lords Justices, instead of an appeal to the House of Lords, which the defeated party desired leave to present. Whatever may be the result of the rehearing, it will be more satisfactory that the important question involved in this case should be decided by the Full Court, than that it should rest upon the opinion of a single judge, even though he be so eminent as Mellish, L.J.

For some time there seems to have been much dissatisfaction felt by a section of the Canadian bar with the administration of justice by the Court of Appeals. "The burden of the charges against the Court of Appeals," says the *Canada Law Journal*, "is the accumulation of arrears of business, resulting in a practical denial of justice, and a want on the part of some of the judges of attention to arguments presented by counsel, and a general carelessness in their adjudications; and, with respect to one of their members, a suspicion that he sometimes gives undue and improper weight to the representations of some lawyers who are said to be favoured above their fellows." The dissatisfaction recently culminated in a series of resolutions passed by a large number of the bar, and presented to the Court of Appeals at a recent sitting. These resolutions were to the effect that the administration of justice in the Court of Queen's Bench has been, for some time past, inefficient, unsatisfactory, and destructive of the confidence which should be reposed in the highest court of the province; and that in the interests of justice, an immediate inquiry by royal commission into the causes of such a lamentable state of affairs is imperatively re-

quired, and that in view of the foregoing resolution the bar of this section abstain from pleading before the Court of Queen's Bench during the present term. and that the chairman of this meeting do communicate this and the foregoing resolution to the said honourable court. It is now stated that Chief Justice Daval and Judge Badgley have sent in their resignations, that Judge Monk has received a year's leave of absence, and that this settles the difficulty between the bench and the bar.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

"SPEEDY JUSTICE" IN THE COUNTY COURTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Surely some improvement should be made at once in our county court system. The following short history of an endeavour to recover a debt in the county court speaks for itself as to the "speedy" (?) "justice which is brought home" (?) "to the doors of the people," by the county courts.

About 21st January, 1874, a summons for debt under £20 was taken out at Bishop Auckland (Circuit No. 15), by a plaintiff residing some distance from the court, the defendants residing in London. The court day on which the summons was made returnable was in the earlier half of February, but no court was held on that day, and all the causes were adjourned until 11th March, because the court day was also a polling day. Unless there is but one large room in Bishop Auckland it is difficult to understand how this could be any reason at all; but admitting the reason, could not a shorter adjournment have been arranged?

On the 11th March the whole day was consumed in trying a "jury" cause, and suitors who had come miles across country, at great inconvenience, to attend the court, had to return home with the melancholy satisfaction of knowing that their causes were again adjourned to about 15th April, when they *may* be tried, or may be adjourned for another month or two. That judgment which, in an undefended cause, would take eight days to obtain in a superior court, thus takes three months to get in the county court.

In the particular instance above referred to, the plaintiff would have got paid if his cause had been heard when the summons was returnable, but the delay will probably have the effect of making him a creditor in the winding up of a limited company, instead of one who by his diligence has been enabled to obtain payment.

The remedies seem to be—allowing judgment by default, shorter adjournments, and exercise of the power to delegate the hearing of undefended causes to the Registrar.

X.

CHIEF CLERK TO THE LORD MAYOR.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Amongst the candidates for the office of "Chief Clerk to the Lord Mayor" are certain members of the Bar. The "prescribed duties" in the "conditions of election" are scarcely up to the dignity of a barrister.

Will the Bar permit the holder of such an office to continue "one of them"? If it will, the sooner the monopoly of all high offices and the division between the two branches is knocked down the better.

A SOLICITOR.

There will be an election of two scholars of International Law in the University of Cambridge on Dr. Whewell's foundation, on Saturday, June 13. The examination will be held in the Law School, on Saturday, the 6th of June, at 9 a.m. The subjects of examination will be International Law and Moral and Political Philosophy.

A correspondent draws attention to an inscription outside a doorway in Moorgate-street, City, in which a gentleman is described as a "Commissioner," whilst a short distance off, in Coleman-street, a brass plate holds forth that the occupant is a "Commissioner for Affidavits." He asks, whether the painter or engraver is to blame?

COURTS.

THE EUROPEAN ASSURANCE SOCIETY
ARBITRATION.*

(Before Lord ROMILLY.)

Oct. 28, 29, 30, 1873; Jan. 9, Feb. 2, 1874.—*Re the European Assurance Society, Phillips' case.**Life Assurance company—Transfer of shares—Pauper transferee—Concealment of facts from directors—Burden of proof upon transferor—Winding up—Contributory.*

Where a shareholder in an assurance company, in which the approval of the directors is necessary to the transfer of shares, pays a person to accept a transfer of his shares, the burden of proof that the transaction is *bona fide* lies upon the transferor; and, upon the company being afterwards wound up, his name will be placed on the list of contributories instead of his transferee's, unless he can show that the consideration expressed to be paid to the transferee was in fact received by him for his own benefit, and that the directors were informed of everything which was material for their decision when they approved the transfer.

This was an application by the joint official liquidator of the European Assurance Society to place the name of Mr. Phillips on the list of contributories instead of that of George Gilbert.

The 96th clause of the European Society's deed of settlement (which is set out at length in *Lloyd's case*, 17 S. J. 46), provided, in effect, that a shareholder who wished to transfer his shares should send to the directors a written notice containing a full description of the proposed transferee, and if the transferee were approved of, or if the directors did not, within fourteen days, propose a substitute, then the shareholder might transfer his shares to the person proposed by him.

The European Society was ordered to be wound up in January, 1872, but the petition on which the order was made had been presented in June of the preceding year, and other petitions had been presented and dismissed since the commencement of 1870.

In August, 1870, Mr. Phillips was the registered proprietor of 590 shares in the above-named society, and was also one of their medical officers, and in receipt of a salary for his services.

Desiring to get rid of his shares he wrote on the 2nd July, 1870, to the secretary of the society, saying that he was going to sell his shares to a Mr. Roberts and asking for a proper form of transfer, to be returned by the bearer of the letter. On the 22nd July he again wrote to the secretary to expedite the business, as he was about to take his family out of town, and expressing surprise that there should have been any delay. This transfer was, however, never carried out in consequence of the bankruptcy of Mr. Roberts, and on the 19th August Mr. Phillips wrote the following letter to the secretary:—

"I have found a much better man to whom to transfer my shares than the Mr. Roberts whom the directors have approved of as my transferee, i.e., one who is pecuniarily more substantial. Will you kindly ask the board to accept this gentleman in lieu of Mr. Roberts, otherwise I must complete the arrangements with him before I leave town to join my family. I shall also be glad if you will kindly forward me a cheque for the last two quarter's salary due at Midsummer last.

P.S. The gentleman's name and address are already at the office in the form of application which I have formally made to the Board of Directors."

Shortly before the date of this letter a notice of an intended transfer from Mr. Phillips to Mr. George Gilbert had been sent to the society, in which the latter was described as "gentleman," and the consideration was stated to be £29 10s. paid by Mr. Phillips.

On the 23rd August the secretary wrote to Mr. Phillips telling him that, pending an appeal petition for the winding up of the society, his application for a transfer could not be entertained.

On the 21st November, 1870, a formal deed of transfer was executed by Mr. Phillips and George Gilbert, by which the latter, in consideration of the sum of £29 10s.

paid to him by Phillips, agreed to take the said shares, subject to the provisions of the deed of settlement of the said society. A receipt for the £29 10s., purporting to be signed by Gilbert, was endorsed on this deed of transfer.

It appeared in evidence that the transfer was effected through a Mr. Bensusan, who was a dealer in shares, though not a sworn broker, and that Mr. Phillips had no previous knowledge of either Bensusan or Gilbert, but had placed the matter in the hands of his solicitor with instructions to dispose of the shares as well as he could.

Gilbert denied that the receipt at the back of the transfer deed was in his handwriting (though this statement was subsequently disproved), or that he had in fact received the £29 10s. from Mr. Phillips. He also stated that he had entered into no contract with Mr. Phillips, and that he had never been in his company or heard his name until the time when he executed the contract.

In the course of the case (the hearing of which extended over several days), the arbitrator was not satisfied by whom the £29 10s. had been received, or how it had been disposed of. Further evidence was therefore taken, partly before the arbitrator, and partly before the assessor, from which it appeared that of the £29 10s., £10 was received by the transfer clerk of the European Society, £11 15s. by Mr. Bensusan and his clerk, and only £7 15s. by Gilbert. All knowledge of this distribution of the money, purporting to be paid to Gilbert as the consideration for the transfer, was most positively denied by the affidavits of Mr. Phillips and his solicitor, Mr. Rivington. It was also proved that Gilbert had been formerly a coach proprietor and driver, but had for many years been blind and wholly destitute of means.

Under these circumstances the joint official liquidator contended that the transfer notice and transfer deed contained material mis-statements of fact, and that the whole transaction, which was merely an attempt on Mr. Phillips' part to get rid of his liability in respect of these shares, was not a *bona fide* transaction, but was a fraud on the other shareholders and creditors of the society, and ought to fail altogether.

Higgins, Q.C. (M. Cookson with him), for the joint official liquidator, argued that it was a breach of duty on the part of the directors to allow a transfer at a time when the society was no doubt insolvent. The duties imposed on the directors by the 96th clause of the deed of settlement had been disregarded by them, and no right or benefit could accrue to this gentleman, who was himself an officer of the society and a shareholder, under a breach of trust and disregard of duty by the directors, who were also his own agents. *Wallon Williams' case*, 18 S. J. 84, was almost on all fours with, and absolutely governed, this case. Bensusan was undoubtedly Mr. Phillips' agent and knew perfectly well what Gilbert was. Clause 96 required Phillips to give the directors full information, and he did not do so. Upon the whole case the transaction was not a *bona fide* one. They also referred to *Read's case* in this arbitration, *Reilly's European Reports*, part 1, page 19.

Southgate, Q.C. (F. C. J. Miller with him), for Mr. Phillips.—The only possible ground on which the liquidator's case can succeed is fraud. The law is perfectly plain that if you, without fraud, transfer your shares before the presentation of the petition on which the winding up order is made, although you do it with the intent to avoid liability in future, that is perfectly good, and cannot be touched. *Budd's case*, 30 Beav. 143, 10 W. R. Ch. Dig. 109, and on appeal, 10 W. R. 51; *Lund's case*, 7 W. R. 333, 27 Beav. 465; *Chinnock's case*, 8 W. R. 255, Johns. 714; *Hyam's case*, 8 W. R. 52, 1 De G. F. & J. 75; *De Pass's case*, 7 W. R. 682, 4 De G. & J. 544; and *Costello's case*, 9 W. R. 6, 2 De G. F. & J. 302, were all cases in which the principle I have just stated was laid down, but in each of them the Court held either that the sale was not *bona fide*, or that there was no out and out transfer. *Weston's case*, 16 W. R. 887, L. R. 6 Eq. 238, and on appeal 17 W. R. 62, L. R. 4 Ch. 20, upheld the same principle. Here, however, the transfer was complete. The directors consented to my transferring my shares, and approved my transferee, and everything was done on my part *bona fide* and properly, as the deed of settlement requires. As to the alleged misdescription in calling Gilbert a "gentleman," that alone will not be sufficient to invalidate the transfer: see *Richard Williams' case*, *Eur. Arb.* printed

* Reported by R. TAUNTON RAIKES, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

Minutes, p. 362. In *W. Williams' case*, 18 S. J. 84; *Payne's case*, 18 W. R. Ch. Dig. 71, L. R. 9 Eq. 223; and *Williams' case*, 18 W. R. Ch. Dig. 71, L. R. 9 Eq. 225, the consideration was wrongly stated as well. The liquidator's case has entirely failed, and it would revolutionize the whole law of joint stock companies to put Mr. Phillips's name upon the register in this case.

Higgins, Q.C., in reply—My friend has somewhat misconceived the law as laid down in *Hyam's*, *De Pass's*, *Chinnock's*, and the other cases he has cited. Some of them refer to a company in which the shares were transferable by delivery. And the effect of all these decisions is, that where there is such notorious insolvency as to impose upon the directors the duty of inquiry, there is no right of transfer. Then, as to the question of fraud, I am not bound to prove either legal, or equitable, or moral fraud as against Mr. Phillips. But Bensusan was his agent, and Bensusan and Birmingham, the society's transfer clerk, were acting together in some way to blind the directors and make them disregard their plain duty. Lord Westbury, in *W. Williams' case*, laid it down as a broad rule that the 96th clause in this deed amounts to a contract that there shall be no getting rid of a liability, and that the directors should have full information of all the circumstances.

Lord ROMILLY, not being satisfied with the evidence in reference to the cheque for £29 10s. alleged to have been received by Gilbert,

This case came on for further hearing on January 9th, 1874, when

Higgins, Q.C., read and commented upon the depositions of three witnesses who had meanwhile been examined before the assessor. He also cited *Musket's case*, 18 S. J. 202.

Lord ROMILLY.—I want you to understand the principle upon which I decide these cases. I have held, as everybody knows, in the Court of Chancery, although the Lords Justices differed with me upon it, that, when a man transfers a share to a pauper in a failing company, he does not get rid of his liability. The Lords Justices held, under Lord Campbell's judgment, that the shareholder was entitled to do it, and, of course, I bowed to that decision; but that has since been considerably altered, and I have had to reconsider it, and to look at the cases before Lord Westbury and Lord Cairns, and to consider what should be done in these cases; and in all cases of transfers to a particular person, with a payment of premium for taking the shares, I have held that if a man chose to speculate in a failing concern, and to take shares in a failing company, he should be at liberty to do so, but I should require that that should be done in the very fullest and plainest manner. And in *Musket's case* I held, and I stated my intention to hold in all these cases, that the burden of proof is upon the transferor; and he must prove that the whole money was paid to the transferee. I should not let the transaction stand unless that was so; and in this case I reserved it upon that point; and I asked Mr. Reilly if he would do me the kindness to see if he could, by the examination of witnesses, find out if there was any clear proof that Gilbert had received the whole of the money: because I thought that his signature upon the receipt was a proof that that he had received the whole; and when Mr. Reilly informed me that he had not found it, I said to him, then you must set the case down for a re-hearing.

F. C. J. Millar.—The case is entirely untouched by any thing which has passed to-day. We submit that the £29 10s. came to Gilbert in the way of receipt, and that was the view your Lordship took on the former occasion. What Birmingham and Bensusan's arrangement with Gilbert was, cannot affect the transferor, if you are satisfied that the transfer was *bona fide*.

Lord ROMILLY.—I want to have it made clear, where a company is failing, and where a premium is paid to a pauper for the purpose of getting rid of shares, that that is unsafe, unless you can prove that the shares were taken as a speculation, and that he received the whole of the money.

Millar.—How can we go farther than get his receipt for the whole sum? We submit that the real questions in this case are—(1) Has there been an out and out transfer? (2) Has the deed of settlement been complied with? (3) Has the approval of the directors been obtained without any untruthful statement? And the answer to each of

these questions is in our favour. He cited *Read's case*; *Reilly's European Rep.* pt. 1, p. 19; *Lloyd's case*, 17 S. J. 46; *Harrison's case*, 19 W. R. 572, L. R. 6 Ch. 286.

Lord ROMILLY.—In this case, if the whole of the facts which now appear upon the evidence had been stated to the directors and they had thought fit to transfer the shares of Mr. Phillips to Gilbert, I do not think anybody could have resisted that; but I have held, and I think it is essential to hold, that in all cases where there is a transfer the fullest information should be given to the directors, if they have the power to reject the transfer or to accept it. In all cases where there is a transferor bribing the transferee to take the shares it is his bounden duty to inform the directors of everything he knows which by any possibility can affect their judgment in the matter. I have held that in one or two cases, and have laid it down as a rule that it is his duty to give the directors full information in respect of the knowledge he possesses. If he had told them here, "I paid £29 10s. to Gilbert, but Gilbert was to give £10 of that to the transfer clerk, £9 15s. of it to the person who negotiated the transaction, £2 to another person, and £7 15s., the balance, to Gilbert," would the directors have accepted it? I do not believe they would. Concealing that fact is, in my opinion, a fraud, and the directors are not to be bound to adopt the transfer under the circumstances. Whether that is so in this case I have not yet made up my mind, but I propose taking the papers home and reading them.

I presume you do not wish to cross-examine any of these parties upon their evidence. If they come within the rule which I have stated then I shall annul this transfer. I have said in the case of *Musket* that I shall do that, and I shall endeavour, in every case that I have to decide, to make, at all events, my decisions consistent with themselves, and not contradictory. That may be the view I shall take of this case of Mr. Phillips. I will mention it the next time I sit.

Judgment reserved.

Feb. 2.—Lord ROMILLY.—Phillips's case calls in question the validity of a transfer of 590 shares for a discount of £29 10s. Mr. Phillips, the owner, applied to Mr. Rivington, his solicitor, to dispose of these shares for anything he could get. Mr. Rivington applied to Mr. Bensusan to dispose of them. Mr. Bensusan was not a member of the Stock Exchange, the shares were not quoted on the Stock Exchange, and apparently no member of the Stock Exchange could be got to deal with them. Mr. Bensusan disposed of the shares for a discount of £29 10s. to a person of the name of Gilbert. After some negotiations with another person, which went off, this arrangement was effected, and the cheque for £29 10s. was handed to Gilbert, who wrote his name across it. The cheque was not further left in his custody, but was paid to Mr. Birmingham, the transfer clerk of the society, who obtained the money from a silversmith in Pall Mall of the name of Clothier, and divided it in the following manner:—Mr. Birmingham took £10, Mr. Bensusan took £9 15s., £2 was paid to another person, and £7 15s. was paid to Gilbert, the transferee. The transferee was a person of no property, a poor blind man who had lent his name for this purpose. The transfer was presented to the directors and was passed by them. Now I said when this case was heard that if all these facts had been stated to the directors, and they had thought fit to pass the transfer in the *bona fide* discharge of their office, no complaint could afterwards have been made. But when the sum of £29 10s. is parcelled out to the various actors in the transaction, and the whole of this concealed from, or at least not disclosed to, the directors, though known to the transfer clerk, who was one of the principal sharers in the booty, I am of opinion that the transaction is a fraudulent mode of getting rid of the shares, and that it cannot stand. By fraudulent transaction I do not mean that Mr. Phillips is guilty of any direct fraud; he employed a respectable solicitor to get rid of his shares. The solicitor inquires who is the sort of person he can get to sell the shares; he is recommended to Mr. Bensusan, who undertakes the transaction, and negotiates the transfer of shares, and employs the persons to obtain and distribute the money. By saying this is a fraudulent transfer and one which cannot stand, I do not mean to impute to Mr. Phillips or to his solicitor any wilful connivance with the transaction or knowledge of what was done. But they wilfully shut their eyes; they employ Mr. Bensusan without inquiry, and allow him and two or three associates to manage the whole transaction, the result of which is that, without inquiry, they

are satisfied with the nominal sum of £29 10s. being handed to Mr. Gilbert, although in truth, the greater part of it was divided between Mr. Bensusan and Mr. Bermingham, the transfer clerk, without the knowledge of the directors and nothing about it appearing on the books of the society. I repeat what I said when the case was heard, that though I disapprove of the practice of throwing the debts of the company on the remaining shareholders, yet I do not mean to lay down that where a person seeks to speculate in shares that are worth less than nothing in the market, in the hope that something may ultimately come out of them, he may not do so. I repeat that in all such transactions in order to make a valid transfer which shall bind the shareholders of the company, who trust their affairs entirely to the directors, it is essential that the full transaction shall be laid before the directors in all its details, and that no officer of the company, particularly one so important as the transfer clerk, who has the care of the books, shall have any pecuniary advantage arising from it. These transactions are very complicated, and it is the object of the persons who are engaged in them to mix them up in such a manner that it is very difficult to unravel them. It is for this reason I have held that the burden of proof in them—in which I have followed Lord Westbury—lies upon the transferor; and that it is his duty to show that everything that is material for the decision of the directors has been brought carefully to their attention. In my opinion that has not been the case here, and therefore I disallow the transfer.

The application of the official liquidator will therefore be allowed, and Mr. Phillips must pay the costs.

Solicitors for the joint official liquidator, *Mercer & Mercer*.
Solicitors for Mr. Phillips, *Kirvington & Son*.

BANKRUPTCY.

(Before the Hon. W. C. SPRING-RICE, sitting as Chief Judge.)

March 6.—*Ex parte MacCormack, re MacCormack.*

In June, 1872, M. filed a petition under the 125th and 126th sections of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and at the first meeting the creditors resolved to accept a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound, payable by five equal instalments. He inserted in the list the International Life Assurance Society (then being wound up) as a creditor for £241, being the whole amount calculated as unpaid on the twenty-five shares held by him, and which he then considered was all his liability to the society.

In the course of the winding up of the society certain expenses were incurred, and it was decided that, although as between themselves and the creditors of the company the contributories could only be called upon to pay the amounts of their respective shares, yet, as between themselves and the liquidator, they were liable to pay, in addition thereto, the costs of the liquidation; and a call of £12 per share was made, and an order granted on M. for payment. M., who had then paid such of the instalments of the composition as were then due on £241, offered to pay the same on the amount of the further call, but the official liquidator declined to receive it.

Upon application being made by M. for an injunction to restrain proceedings under the order,

Held, that the liability was provable under the 31st section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and that M. was entitled to an injunction, subject to the payment of the composition.

This was an application on behalf of Michael James MacCormack (a non-trader) for an order that Frederick Maynard, the official liquidator of the International Life Assurance Society, should be restrained from taking any further proceedings upon the order of the chief clerk made in the matter of the winding up of the society on the 28th of February, 1874.

On the 13th of June, 1872, the debtor presented a petition for the liquidation of his affairs under the 125th and 126th sections of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and the first meeting of his creditors was appointed to be held on the 10th July. At that meeting it was resolved that a composition of 2s. 6d. in the pound should be accepted in satisfaction of the debts due to the creditors from the said debtor. That such composition be payable as follows:—6d. in the pound on the 1st August then next, 6d. on the 1st February, 1873, 6d. on the 1st August, 1873, 6d. on the 1st February, 1874, 6d. on the 1st August, 1874.

At that time the debtor inserted in the list the International Life Assurance Society, and the official liquidator thereof as creditors in his statement of affairs for £241 4s. 7d., being the whole amount calculated as unpaid on the twenty-five shares held by him, and which he then considered was all his liability to the society. The resolutions were subsequently confirmed at the second meeting, held on the 19th July, 1872, and were afterwards duly registered.

Prior to the institution of the proceedings, the official liquidator of the company had presented a petition for adjudication in bankruptcy against the debtor, but upon the resolutions being duly registered the petition was dismissed.

It appeared that during the course of the winding up of the society certain proceedings were taken by the official liquidator in America and other places abroad to recover a large asset alleged to belong to the society. These proceedings were, however, unsuccessful, and a considerable sum of money was required by the official liquidator to meet the expenses of the proceedings, over and above the amounts received by him in respect of the calls on the shares, and it was decided by the Vice-Chancellor that, although as between themselves and the creditors of the company the contributories could only be called upon to pay the amounts of their respective shares, yet as between themselves and the liquidator they were liable to pay in addition thereto the costs of the liquidation, and accordingly a call of £25 was made on each of such shares to meet the said expenses.

The order making the call was subsequently appealed against, and on the 28th July, 1873, the same was varied, and in lieu thereof a call of £12 per share was ordered to be made, and in pursuance thereof an order was afterwards made for the payment by the debtor of the sum of £300, being the amount of the call upon the twenty-five shares held by the debtor.

The debtor had duly paid the first three instalments of the composition, and on the 2nd October, 1873, his solicitors, Messrs. Stocken & Jupp, wrote to the official liquidator stating that he was prepared to pay the three instalments due on the sum of £300, and that he would pay the two remaining instalments as they became due.

Some correspondence followed, and on the 21st January, 1874, the debtor was served with a summons, dated the 17th January, and issued by the official liquidator, returnable before the Chief Clerk on the 28th January, for an order for payment of £300 into the Bank of England on or before the 26th of February. The facts were submitted to the Chief Clerk upon the return of the summons, but he considered that such occasion was not the proper time for urging the same, but that if the official liquidator proceeded to enforce the order, then would be the time for the debtor to make such application as he might be advised.

The debtor had since paid to the official liquidator the instalment of the composition due on the 1st February upon the amount of the debt returned by him in his statement of affairs, and he was ready and willing to pay the whole of the instalments now due in respect of the sum of £300, but the official liquidator declined to receive the same.

Finlay Knight in support of the application.—The debt in this case is a debt provable under the composition, and the Court has jurisdiction to restrain the creditor: section 13, Bankruptcy Act, 1869, rule 260. The liability existed at the date of the petition being filed, and was provable under the 31st section: *Companies Act, 1862, s. 75*. In *Ex parte the Llynvi Coal Company, Re Hyde*, 20 W. R. 105, L. R. 7 Ch. 23, James, L.J., said the broad purview of the Act was that the bankrupt was to be a freedman—freed not only from debts but from contracts, liabilities, engagements, and contingencies of every kind. Then what is the effect of the omission from the list of the liability? The creditor has been passive; he has acted upon the statement made by the debtor; and as soon as the liability is ascertained the debtor tenders the amount of the composition. Doubtless at law if a debtor does not comply with the terms of the composition his debts revive: *Edwards v. Coombe*, 21 W. R. 107, L. R. 7 C. P. 619; but in *Ex parte Hedge, Re Hatton*, 20 W. R. 978, L. R. 7 Ch. 723, James, L.J., said there might be cases in which by accident, and not by default of the debtor, the composition

was not duly paid, and then, no doubt, this Court would relieve the debtor from the effect of such an accident, and remove any injustice. *Ex parte Pencock, Re Duffield*, 21 W. R. 755, L. R. 8 Ch. 682, was a different case, because there the debt was admitted, and the debtor did not tender to the creditor the composition on the amount inserted in the list: *Ex parte Hartel, re Thorpe*, 21 W. R. 428, L. R. 8 Ch. 743.

Grosvenor Woods for the official liquidator.—The composition in this case is not binding. The 126th section, 7th par., provides that "the provisions of a composition accepted by an extraordinary resolution in pursuance of this section shall be binding on all the creditors whose names and addresses, and the amount of the debts due to whom, are shown in the statement of the debtor produced to the meetings at which the resolution was passed, but shall not affect or prejudice the rights of any other creditors." *Ex parte Hartel, Re Thorpe* (*ubi sup.*) is in my favour. The debtor has made no estimate of the liability, and the creditor is not bound: *Ex parte Pickering, Re Pickering*, L. R. 4 Ch. 58. The 126th section, 8th par., provides that any mistake made inadvertently by a debtor in the statement of his debts may be corrected after the prescribed notice has been given with the consent of a general meeting of the creditors. This consent has not been obtained. *Davis's case*, in the European Assurance Society Arbitration 17 S. J. 670, is a strong authority to show that the liability was not provable.

Knight in reply.

SPRING-RICE (Registrar).—I am not sufficiently familiar with the practice in the judges' chambers to know how far the Chief Clerk feels himself bound in settling a list of contributories to go into such an objection—whether he does not settle the list of contributories according to their legal liabilities *inter se*, leaving it for Courts of particular jurisdiction, such as the Bankruptcy Court, to decide whether or not the person so placed on the list has been by operation of law relieved entirely or in part from such liability. But, whatever this practice may be, I am clearly of opinion that there is jurisdiction in this Court to consider the question, and I feel bound to consider it. Now it was argued that a different principle would prevail in regard to resolutions to liquidate by arrangement and a resolution like the present to accept a composition. In the one case the estate of the debtor is vested in a trustee for the benefit of the creditors. In the other the estate is left in the debtor who undertakes to pay the composition accepted by the creditors. I do not agree to this distinction. By the words of the Act the resolution is "binding on all the creditors whose names and addresses, and the amounts of the debts due to whom, are shown in the statement of the debtor." Here the official liquidator appears in this list, and clearly if the amount of his debt was stated in the list he would be bound by the terms of the Act itself. But it is urged that this claim in regard to the liquidation costs was not set out in the list, and indeed could not have been so, the liability having been ascertained subsequently to the passing of the resolution, and that even supposing it possible to have anticipated such a claim it was not capable of estimation under the 31st section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. Now I do not consider that it was so incapable of estimation. I must say, having regard to the very large words of this section, as well as of the 75th section of the Companies Act of 1862, I think it would have been possible for the liquidator to have made an estimate to include such a liability—at any rate, whatever it was, it existed at the time of the registration of the resolution. And it may be proper to observe that with regard to the liability of estates in liquidation or bankruptcy under the Winding-up Acts, according to the cases both before and subsequent to the Act of 1869, it seems clear where the winding-up order precedes the proceedings in liquidation or bankruptcy such liability constitutes a debt provable under such proceedings. It is true that under the 31st section the Court may declare the value of the debt incapable of being fairly estimated, in which case it is to be deemed a debt not provable in bankruptcy. But this course has not been taken here nor, having regard to the cases already decided on the meaning of this section, do I think such a course could have been taken. In particular I would refer to the very strong remarks of James, L.J., in *Ex parte Hyde, Re the Llynvi Coal and Iron Company* (*ubi sup.*). If the contention of the respondent be correct I do not think it would be possible for

any resolutions to be passed in regard to the estate of a debtor whose list comprised the name of an official liquidator. I am not unmindful of the case to which I was referred before Lord Westbury in the European Arbitration, 17 S. J. 670. I think the very pungent remarks of that noble and learned Lord must have had reference, not to whether or not the rights of the official liquidator in regard to costs were limited to the amount on which he originally proved in the bankruptcy, but as to the question whether he was not at liberty to increase his proof on the amount of the costs being ascertained. The debtor having tendered the amount of the instalments of the composition now due, and undertaking to pay the future instalments, I am of opinion that the injunction granted by Mr. Registrar Murray should be made perpetual.

Solicitors for the debtor, *Stocken & Jupp*

Solicitor for the official liquidator, *J. Tucker*.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. FRANCIS SNOWDEN, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Colony of Hong Kong. Mr. Snowden was educated at Rugby School and at University College, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1854. In Hilary Term of the same year he was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn, and for some years practised on the Western Circuit, and at the Bristol, Bath, and Salisbury Sessions. He was appointed senior magistrate of the Court of Requests at the Straits Settlements in November, 1871, and a few months ago was gazetted as a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court there (see *ante* p. 121).

Mr. GEORGE PHILLIPPO, a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlements, has succeeded Mr. Snowden as Senior Puisne Judge of that court. Mr. Phillippo was last year appointed Junior Puisne Judge of the court (see *ante* p. 121).

Mr. THEODORE THOMAS FORD, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Junior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Straits Settlements. Mr. Ford was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1866, and has been a member of the Western Circuit.

Sir JOHN SMALE, Chief Justice of the Colony of Hong Kong, who has just been knighted, was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1842. In 1860 he was appointed Attorney-General of Hong Kong, in succession to Mr. Chisholm Anstey, and became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of that colony in February, 1866.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 19.—*Government Measures*.—The Queen's Speech was read by the Lord Chancellor. The following were the portions relating to legislation:—

"The delay and expense attending the transfer of land in England have long been felt to be a reproach to our system of law, and a serious obstacle to dealings in real property. This subject has, in former sessions, occupied the attention of Parliament, and I trust that the measures which will now be submitted for your consideration will be found calculated to remove much of the evil of which complaint has been made.

You will probably be of opinion that the re-arrangement of the judicature, and the blending of the administration of law and equity, which were effected for England by the enactment of last Session, ought, on the same principles, to be extended to Ireland, and you will be asked to devote some part of your time to the accomplishment of this object.

The greater part of these changes would be inapplicable to the tribunals of Scotland; but you will be invited, as to that part of my kingdom, to consider the most satisfactory mode of bringing the procedure upon appeals into harmony with recent legislation, and among other measures relating to her special interests, a bill for amending the law relating to land rights and for facilitating the transfer of land will be laid before you.

A bill will be introduced dealing with such parts of the Acts regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors as have given

rise to complaints which appear to deserve the interference of Parliament.

Your attention will also be directed to the laws affecting friendly and provident societies."

Land Transfer.—The Lord Chancellor gave notice that on Thursday next he should call attention to the subject of the sale and transfer of land in England.

Private Bills.—On the motion of Lord Redesdale, the following resolutions were agreed to:—

"That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill after Monday, the 30th day of this instant March, unless such Private Bill shall have been approved by the Court of Chancery; nor any petition for a Private Bill approved by the Court of Chancery after Monday, the 12th day of May next.

"That this House will not receive any report from the judges upon petitions presented to this House for Private Bills after Monday, the 12th day of May next."

"That so much of Standing Order No. 179, section 3, as requires that 'no such Bill shall be read a second time earlier than the fourth day nor later than the seventh day after the first reading thereof' be suspended during the present session, and that every such Bill shall be read a second time on the fourth day after the first reading thereof, whether the Standing Orders applicable thereto have or have not been complied with; and that so much of the Order of the 15th day of March, 1859, as requires two clear days' notice of the day on which any Bill shall be examined shall also be suspended during the present session in respect to Bills originating in this House

"That in the event of the list of Bills in either of the two classes of private Bills which are to commence in this House being settled on Friday, the 20th day of March, this House will meet on Saturday, the 21st day of March, when all such Bills which the promoters intend to proceed with must be read a first time; and that all such Bills in the case of which the examiners shall have certified that the Standing Orders have not been complied with shall be referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Tuesday, the 24th day of March."

OBITUARY.

MR. H. ROBERTS.

The death of Mr. Henry Roberts, barrister-at-law, one of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, took place very suddenly on the 15th inst., at Southsea. Mr. Roberts, who was in his sixty-second year, was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1836, and in 1840 he was appointed by Lord John Russell, then Colonial Secretary, to a judicial post in Jamaica. He became Commissioner of Education for that colony in 1845. In January, 1853, he resigned his various offices in Jamaica, on being appointed private secretary to the Duke of Newcastle, then Colonial Secretary. In December, 1854, on the Duke of Newcastle becoming Secretary of State for War, Mr. Roberts was nominated Under-Secretary at the War Office, which office he resigned in March, 1855. In October of the same year he was appointed a Commissioner of Inland Revenue at Somerset House, which office he held at the date of his death. The appointment is worth £1,200 per annum.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday, the 18th March, the subject for the evening's debate being—"That an acceptance of a retainer or papers by counsel should constitute a simple contract." The motion was carried by a majority of three.

We regret to learn that the doctors have ordered Mr. Justice Honyman to take entire rest for a time. He is stated to be suffering from a nervous affection, accompanied with slight attacks of paralysis. Mr. Justice Grove has taken his place on the South Wales Circuit.

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE LAW OF DEFAMATION.

[We print for the amusement of our readers the following effusion with which a contributor favours the *Albany Law Journal*; but we disclaim any responsibility for the accuracy of the statements it contains.—Ed. S. J.]

To attribute a slander in law requires as much accuracy as the allegations of a pleading. If a man says in one breath that I am a murderer, and killed my wife, and in the next breath says that my temper is bad enough to kill any woman who had to live with me, the law charitably gives him the benefit of his latter breath, and takes notice that I am charged with having an unpleasant disposition, rather than with being a Blue Beard. This is a very good thing for a layman to know. If one wants to free his mind concerning a neighbour whom he dislikes, he may call him every opprobrious name in the language, and charge him with every crime in the decalogue, taking good care, however, to wind up with a peroration to some innocuous effect, like the above. Of course he must not charge him with any thing that would hurt him in his trade or occupation, for that means money, and of that the law takes note. For instance: A declaration for slander stated that the plaintiff was a pork-butcher, and then charged the defendant with publishing to the plaintiff, in presence of others, these words concerning the plaintiff: "You are a bloody thief! Who stole F's pigs? You did, you bloody thief, and I can prove it! You poisoned them with mustard and brimstone." There was an innuendo that the plaintiff was guilty of pig-stealing. The jury found that the words were not intended to impute felony, but were spoken of the plaintiff in relation to his trade. Held, that the plaintiff was not entitled to recover, as the words used did not show that they were spoken of him in relation to his trade, and there was no charge in the declaration that they were so spoken (*Sibley v. Tomlins*, 4 Tyr. 90).

One must not hope to escape the penalties of slander by a charge conveyed through a reference to the best authors. To say that such and such a person is "a lively snake" would not excite any remark or animadversion, but to say that the same person is "a frozen snake" is a serious matter (*Hoare v. Silverlock*, 12 Q. B. 624). "We ought," says Coleridge, J., "to attribute to a jury an acquaintance with ordinary terms and allusions, whether historical or figurative, or parabolical. If an expression, originally allegorical, has passed into such common use that it ceases to be figurative, and has obtained a signification almost literal, we must understand it as it is used. The term 'frozen snake' has an application very generally known, which is calculated to bring into contempt a person against whom it is directed. If, therefore, a publication imputes to a person that his friends, who have been assisting him, have realised in him the fable of the frozen snake, it is for a jury to say whether these words do not convey an imputation of ingratitude to friends and benefactors, and if they do they are actionable." Again, one might, perhaps, in the heat of passion safely call another "Robinson Crusoe," but I am not so certain about "man Friday." A count in an action for libel, charging that the defendant wrote of the plaintiff that he was a "man Friday" to another, was held bad for want of an averment to show that by the term "Friday," as applied to the plaintiff, degradation and subserviency were intended to be imputed to him (*Forbes v. King*, 1 Dowl. P. C. 672). So *Æsop* and *De Foe* are authors of some mischief as well as a great deal of good.

A slander conveyed by reference to the animal kingdom is not always secure. "Frozen snake" will not answer, as we have seen. "Lame duck" (*Morris v. Langdale*, 2 B. & P. 284), as applied to a broker; "black sheep" (*Barnet v. Allen*, 3 H. & N. 381), as applied to an attorney; "dirty slut" (*Wilson v. Runyon*, Wright, 651), as applied to a schoolmistress; and "quack," as applied to a physician, are equally objectionable. Nor may an artist make a likeness of his patron as "speaking" as to convey a libel. Thus, where one refused to accept a portrait of himself, painted for him by an artist, on the ground that it was no likeness, and the artist, to revenge himself, added asses' ears to the head, and exposed the picture for sale, this was held libellous (*Mezzara's case*, N. Y. Sessions, 1817), the plaintiff being able, it seems, to recognise the likeness after the addition. There is no law, however, against calling an innkeeper a "caterpillar" (*Vin. Abr. Act. for Words*, U. s. 34).

and it was held not actionable to say of a justice: "He is a logger-headed, a slouch-headed, and a bursen-bellied hound" (1 Keb. 629).

It is not always safe to repeat what one says of himself. He may have a worse opinion of himself than his acquaintances are warranted in having of him, and must not suffer through his own sense of his demerits. It is no defence, therefore, to an action for libel, to show that a ludicrous narrative in a newspaper concerning the plaintiff was only a repetition of a story told by the plaintiff of himself, "for there is a great difference between a man's telling a ludicrous story of himself, to a circle of his own acquaintance, and a publication of it to all the world through the medium of a newspaper" (*Cooke v. Ward*, 6 Bing. 415). But I suppose if the "circle" were a "sewing circle," the judge's observation would not apply.

When we come to examine the law of defamation of persons in respect to their trade, business, office, or occupation, we strike a very rich vein. Mr. Heard, in his "Curiosities of the Law Reporters," cites a few amusing cases respecting lawyers: "It is actionable to call a counsellor a daffodowndilly, if there be an averment that the words signify an ambidexter (1 Roll. Abr. 55, pl. 17, *Peare's case*), or to say of an attorney that he hath no more law than Master Cheyny's bull, even although Master Cheyny actually had no bull, for if that be the case, as Keeling, C. J., observed, 'the scandal is the greater' (1 Siderfin, 327, *Baker v. Morfue*). And it is quite clear that to say that a lawyer 'hath no more law than a goose' is actionable (1 id. 424); and the reporter adds a query whether it be not actionable to say a lawyer 'hath no more law than the man in the moon.'" In another case, it was held actionable to say of an attorney that "he is no more a lawyer than the devil" (*Day v. Buller*, 3 Wils. 59). It seems quite superfluous to decide that it is not actionable to say of a lawyer that he kept back his bill fifteen years until his client was dead (*Reeves v. Tomplar*, 2 Jur. 137, Exch.). Very few clients would complain of such treatment. As to physicians, the hardest case is that where it was held actionable to say, "he has killed six children in one year" (*Carroll v. White*, 33 Barb. 615); the estimate seems to us quite reasonable. We may say of a clergyman, with impunity, that he is a remarkably bad preacher (*Gathercole v. Miall*, 15 M. & W. 344). But how it could be held that the charge that "he is a lewd adulterer, and hath two children by the wife of C. S.," is not actionable (*Parrett v. Carpenter*, Noy, 64), we cannot conceive. Whether it would be slanderous to say of a judge that he is long-eared we will not undertake to determine; but to say that he is "half-eared" has been held actionable (*Masham v. Bridges*, Cro. Car. 223). It is quite satisfactory to know that one may with safety, as well as justice, say of an alderman, "when he puts on his gown Satan enters it" (2 Starkie on Slander, 314) and charge a member of Parliament with want of sincerity (*Onslow v. Horne*, 2 W. Black. 750).

It seems that whether an oral charge is actionable or not may depend on the intelligence of the hearers. That a charge is physically or legally impossible does not always relieve it of its slanderous character. The well-known case of the woman charged with having given birth to a litter of pups is an example. Probably if uttered to a physician or to Mr. Darwin, it would not be slanderous, for even Mr. Darwin knows better. But to a promiscuous audience the case would be different (*Kennedy v. Gifford*, 19 Wend. 296; *Ausman v. Veal*, 10 Ind. 355). It is important to know, that in the present state of scientific knowledge, it is quite safe to say of an enemy, that his far off progenitors were apes. In another case (*per Fenner, J.*, Bulst. 40.) it was decided that to say, "Thou art as very a thief as any in Warwick gaol," no thief then being in the gaol, would not be actionable, but if a thief is in the gaol at the time, the words would be actionable. But would not the hearers naturally infer that there was a thief in the gaol, and understand that an accusation of theft was intended?

Although something depends upon the intelligence of the hearer, the same does not seem to be true of the person making the charge. Thus, where one said of a jeweller, "He is a cozening knave in selling me a sapphire for a diamond," it was held actionable (*Vin. Abr. Act for Words*, l. a. 9). It would seem that one who does not know a sapphire from a diamond is indeed stone blind.

We have seen that it is actionable to utter injurious falsehoods concerning a person in his trade, business, office, or occupation. But it is not actionable in good faith to

speak disparagingly of an article that the person may manufacture or deal in. For instance, it would be slander to say of Jones, that he is a vulgar, ignorant, and scurrilous editor; but it would not be slanderous to say that Jones' newspaper is a vulgar, ignorant, and scurrilous journal. As experience shows, this may be a benefit rather than a detriment to Jones. To say that Jones' newspaper is in low circulation, however, is actionable (*Heriot v. Stuart*, 1 Esp. Cas. 437). One may, without malice, securely say that Robinson's candles are short of weight, but not that Robinson makes his candles short of weight, for that would implicate him in a wicked business. The effect of both allegations may be the same so far as the sale of the candles goes, but not the same as to Robinson's character. It is valuable to know these distinctions. *Sampson*, in the play, took care to inquire the law before he committed himself:

"Abram. Do you bite your thumb at us, sir?"

"Sampson. Is the law on our side if I say—ay?"

"Gregory. No."

"Sampson. No, sir, I do not bite my thumb at you, sir, but I bite my thumb."

And so, being armed in the law, a layman may bite his own thumb or his neighbour's back with impunity.

THE NEW COUNTY COURT JUDGE AT HULL.

Mr. F. A. Bedwell, the new judge of the Hull County Court, took his seat on Monday for the first time. There were many members of the legal profession present.

Mr. Gresham, the magistrates' clerk and President of the Law Society, was the first to address his Honour. He said he appeared there that morning solely in his representative character, to tender Mr. Bedwell his warmest congratulations upon the appointment with which her Majesty had honoured him. He expressed a hope that his Honour might long preside there, and that the same kind and courteous feeling which the late Mr. Raines exhibited to the members of the profession would be shown to them by him, and that it would be reciprocated by them.

Mr. Cook, as one of the senior members of the profession present, added his congratulations.

His Honour, in reply, said he could not tell them what a gratification it was to a stranger like himself, who had left behind him at a very great distance the warm and cherished associations of a lifetime, to find himself so kindly received by those with whom he had to live and work in the future, and he sincerely thanked them for the personal consideration they had shown to him. He was delighted to find that there was in that important commercial centre so valuable a body as the Law Institution. He was quite certain from his professional experience that too much honour could not be paid to that body, too much value could not be attributed to it, and too much importance could not be attached to it. They lived in an age when probably there never was greater honour paid to the profession to which they belonged. The judges of this realm—in the higher courts—stood in a position of honour which had probably never been attained in any other country, and very likely never would be attained. At this time they were particularly reminded of it, because the Legislature had some years ago taken the remarkable step of giving the judges of this realm the extraordinary power of deciding who shall sit in the House of Commons. He considered that a tribute which was one of the highest ever paid to any professional men. Now how had that been arrived at? Simply by *prestige* and *esprit de corps*. Not the *prestige* and *esprit de corps* of the bar alone, but the *prestige* and *esprit de corps* of the two bodies of the profession, acting and re-acting on each other. It was impossible for a person taking the chair as he did now, in a court in which he had not had the privilege of practising, to take it without feelings of very considerable anxiety, particularly when he followed one of such great experience and power as his predecessor. All he would say upon that point was that he should faithfully endeavour to make this court as useful to the inhabitants of Hull and the district as he possibly could. There was one thing he did not intend to do. He did not intend to try to find twelve working days in one week. He had seen that tried, and he had seen it always fail. But what he would always do, and what he proposed to do, was to sit as many days as were necessary to do the work. He had proposed to Mr. Phillips, and it would be laid before the Law Institution, and he should be obliged to them if they would consider it,

that in settling the May, June, July, and August sittings, they should add at least one day to the six already appointed for the purpose, and that if necessary they should add two. In conclusion, Mr. Bedwell intimated that it was his intention as soon as possible to find a residence near Hull. The Secretary of the Law Society stated that the society would consider the subject of an alteration of the sittings on Thursday evening.

LEGAL ITEMS.

Mr. Whalley has written to the treasurer of Gray's Inn stating, "As I see by the public press that the benchers are moved to investigate Dr. Kenely's conduct in the late trial at Bar of the *Queen v. Tichborne*, I think it right and respectful to the Bench, being myself a member of Gray's Inn, to intimate that it is my intention to prefer a charge against Mr. Hawkins, Q.C., to the Benchers of the Middle Temple, for the conduct of that gentleman in imputing to me the having been engaged in a conspiracy to promote the cause of the defendant."

The House of Commons' Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills on Standing Order proofs resumed their sittings on Thursday, and will report that in the case of the Southern Railway Bill the Standing Orders have been complied with. The Liverpool Corporation Water Bill was withdrawn. The opposition to the Ipswich and Felixstowe Railway and Pier Bill was withdrawn, and this now unopposed case will be taken on Monday next, as also the Cairn and Mitchelstown Railway Bill, also unopposed. This will complete the list of petitions for Private Bills before the Examiners, so far as the House of Commons is concerned.

A bill has passed the House of Representatives which requires United States Marshals and clerks of United States courts who have received fees and emoluments in excess of their legal compensation, to deposit the same with the treasurer of the United States; in case of refusal, suits to be brought, and future cases of the kind to be punished as a misdemeanour; special agents to be appointed to examine the accounts of those officials who are to be paid out of the fees and emoluments recovered, but their total emoluments not to exceed 5,000 dols. in any one year.

Judge Hoffman, of the United States District Court for the district of California, has, says the *Albany Law Journal*, recently decided that a married woman living apart from her husband may, if she has committed an act of bankruptcy, be adjudged a bankrupt. The statute of California provides that the earnings of a wife, living separate from her husband, shall be her separate property, and that she shall have the sole and exclusive control of her separate property, and that she may sue and be sued, and that she shall be subject to all legal process in all actions. Judge Hoffman's opinion is based upon this statute.

A correspondent points out several inaccuracies in the paragraph in the *Times* relating to lawyers who have been returned to Parliament by constituencies in Ireland, which we last week extracted. Mr. Law, Q.C., is the late, not the present Solicitor-General for Ireland. "Mr. Johnston," he says, "is not and never was a practising barrister, but a country gentleman, called, for other purposes, to the bar; the same remark applies to Mr. Macartney and Sir J. Esmonde; Sir George Bowyer and Mr. Synan have long ceased to practise; and Sir Patrick O'Brien, although he was called to the Irish Bar in 1844, has not even an address in Ireland, except the University Club. Besides these it is not quite accurate to speak of Mr. Plunket and Mr. P. J. Smyth as practising barristers, though they do not so clearly belong to the class 'who do not practise' as the others I have mentioned. Mr. Plunket, as is well known, only the other day refused high professional advancement, avowedly because his aspirations are political rather than professional; and I think I am not far from the truth when I say that Mr. Smyth, although he has been called to the bar since his return from Australia, contemplates nothing less than a professional career."

The following list of petitions arising out of the late General Election, with the names of the petitioners and

the sitting members who appear as respondents, has been issued:—Hackney—Gill, petitioner; Holms and Reed, respondents. Kidderminster—Willis and another, petitioners; Grant, respondent. Stockport—Oldfield and another, petitioners; Hopwood and Pennington, respondents. Wakefield—Lee and another, petitioners; Green, respondent. Windsor—Herbert and another, petitioners; Richardson Gardner, respondent. Petersfield—Stowe, petitioner; Jolliffe, respondent. Dudley—Hingley and others, petitioners; Sheridan, respondent. Boston—Malcolm, petitioner; Ingram and Parry, respondents. Barnstaple—Fleming, petitioner; Cave and Waddy, respondents. Haverfordwest—Davies, petitioner; Lord Kensington, respondent. Stroud—Baynes and others, petitioners; Stanton and Dickinson, respondents. Launceston—Drinkwater, petitioner; Deakin, respondent. Durham—James and another, petitioners; Henderson and Thompson, respondents. Bolton—Ornrod and others, petitioners; Cross, respondent. Poole—Hurdle and another, petitioners; Waring, respondent. Isle of Wight—Ashley, petitioner; Cochrane, respondent. Pombroke—White, petitioner; Reed, respondent. Durham (county), Northern Division—Burdon and others, petitioners; Bell and Palmer, respondents. Durham (county), Southern Division—Sartees and others, petitioners; Pease and Beaumont, respondents. The following are announced as the judges by whom, and the dates at which, some of the above petitions will be tried:—Hackney, Grove, J., April 14; Kidderminster, Bramwell, B., April 14; Stockport, Mellor, J., April 14; Wakefield, Grove, J., April 21; Windsor, Bramwell, B., April 21; and Petersfield, Mellor, J., April 21.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Hilary Term, 1874.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

At the Examination of Candidates for Admission on the Roll of Attorneys and Solicitors of the Superior Courts, the Examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of twenty-six, as being entitled to Honorary Distinction:—

1. William Arnold Hepburn, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. J. G. Hepburn & Son, of London.
2. John Archbald Dixon, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Hodge & Harle, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
3. Charles Gover Woodroffe, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Watson & Sons, of London.
4. Charles Leopold Samson, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Grundy & Kershaw, of Manchester.
5. Herbert Beaumont, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Fernandes & Gill, of Wakefield.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following Prizes of Books:—

To Mr. Hepburn, the Prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's Inn.

To Mr. Dixon, the Prize of the Honourable Society of Clement's Inn.

To Mr. Woodroffe, Mr. Samson, and Mr. Beaumont, Prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The Examiners have also certified that the following Candidates, under the age of twenty-six, whose names are placed in alphabetical order, passed Examinations which entitle them to commendation:—

James Grundy, who served his Clerkship to Mr. Christopher Wilson Dawson, of Bolton-le-Moors, and Messrs. Woodcock & Ryland, of London.

Arnold Heseltine, who served his Clerkship to Mr. Charles Blake, of 4, Serjeants' Inn, London, and Messrs. Cunliffe & Beaumont, of London.

Isaac Gaitskell Jennings, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Benson & Moorad, of Cockerham.

William Morley, who served his Clerkship to Mr. Henry Edward Mason, of Barton-upon-Humber.

William Burd Pearce, who served his Clerkship to Mr. John Pearce, of Hatherleigh, Devon, and Messrs. Vizard, Crowder, & Anstie, of London.

John Alexander Tilleard, who served his Clerkship to Messrs. Tilleard, Godden, & Holme, of London, and Messrs. McLeod & Watney, of London.

Albert Watts, who served his Clerkship to Mr. Edward Watts, of Hythe, Kent, and Mr. John Wills, of London. The Council have accordingly awarded them Certificates of Merit.

The Examiners have further announced to the following Candidates that their Answers to the Questions at the Examination were highly satisfactory, and would have entitled them to Honorary Distinction if they had not been above the age of twenty-six:—

Would have been entitled to Prizes.

Thomas Mark Taylor,
Richard Barker, the younger.

Would have been entitled to Certificates of Merit.

Samuel Budd, B.A.
Frank Gearey,
Thomas Hudson.

The number of Candidates examined in this Term was 179; of these, 155 passed, and 24 were postponed.

By order of the Council,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.
Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, London.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Mar. 20, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85 9½
Ditto for Account, April 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced, 90½	Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. par
New 3 per Cent., 90½	Ditto, £200, Do par
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, per
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock 5
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year)
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 205	Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct. Jan. '73
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 10½
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 167½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.
Ditto for Account, —	April, '84 —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '81 101½	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 100
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto Rupee Ppr., 4 per Cent. 94½	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	123
Stock Caledonian	100	97½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	103
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	4½
Stock Great Northern	100	137½
Stock Do., A Stock	100	158½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	112
Stock Great Western—Original	100	127½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	145
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	84½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	12½
Stock London and North-Western	100	147½
Stock London and South-Western	100	108½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	75½
Stock Metropolitan	100	65½
Stock Do., District	100	25½
Stock Midland	100	132½
Stock North British	100	68½
Stock North Eastern	100	70
Stock North London	100	13
Stock North Staffordshire	100	64
Stock South Devon	100	68
Stock South-Eastern	100	110

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

No change was made on Thursday in the bank rate of discount. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from 47·92 last week to 46·87 this week. The railway market has been characterised by dullness and inactivity. North British fell on Wednesday on the announcement that there will be no dividend for the ordinary shareholders for the past half-year. The foreign market has been steady, but Austrian securities fell on Monday, on heavy sales for German account. Consols for delivery closed on Thursday 92 to ½.

The Railway Share Trust Company (Limited) is instructed to offer for public subscription 2,500,000 dols. Seven per Cent. Consolidated Gold Bonds of the Chicago and North Western Railway Company, which is the

largest of all the railway systems of the United States. The price of issue per bond of 1,000 dols. is £188, payable by instalments extending to July 1st. At the price of subscription these bonds will pay seven and a-half per cent. per annum. The bonds of the present issue will be specially endorsed by the railway company as to the payment of the interest at £14 per bond per annum, and principal at the rate of £200 per bond, payable in London. The bonds are 1 to 1½ prem. The lists will close on Wednesday next for town, and on the following day for the country.

The annual general meeting of the Law Union Insurance Company will be held on Thursday next.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

WARRY—On March 14, at 46, Norfolk-square, Hyde-park, the wife of George Deedes Warry, Esq., Barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

BROWNE—LUSH—On March 14, at St. Paul's Church, Avenue-road, J. H. Balfour Browne, Esq., Barrister-at-law, to Caroline Emma, fourth daughter of the Hon. Mr. Justice Lush.

DEATHS.

BOULT—On March 3, at 12, Leinster-square, Bayswater, Robert Boulton, Esq., Barrister-at-law.

DENNEY—On March 16, at 2, King Henry-street, Mildmay-road, Islington, Michael Denney, Esq., Barrister-at-law, aged 69.

BRADLEY—On March 15, at Blackheath, Henry Bradley, solicitor, of Harcourt-buildings, Temple, in his 59th year.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Britton, John James, and Henry Lucas Turner, attorneys at law and solicitors in chancery, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. March 5
Mayhew, Arthur, Wilfred Bachby, and James Henry Holden, attorneys at law and solicitors, Staple inn, Middlesex. March 5
Pierce, Walter, and Robert Rundle, attorneys and solicitors, Castle st, Liverpool, and Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire. Jan 1

TUESDAY, March 17, 1874.

Enfield, Richard, and Benjamin Dowson, attorneys and solicitors, Low pavement, Nottingham. March 9

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies

FRIDAY, March 13, 1874.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Essex Shrievalty Fund for defraying the Expenses of the Sheriff of the county of Essex.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Feb 14, appointed Thomas Morgan Gopp, Chelmsford, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before April 6, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Monday, April 13 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Auvergne Bituminous Rock and Paving Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Bertram Smart and James Marriot, Chancery. Thursday, April 30 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Rhos Slate and Slab Quarry Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 3, directed to be heard before the Vice-Chancellor, at Stone building, Lincoln's inn, on Tuesday, March 24. Gill, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1874.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Wetherby Gas Light Company.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated March 6, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hamilton, Great James st, Bedford row, agent for Keil, Wetherby, solicitor for the petitioner.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Beaconhill Fire Brick and Clay Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated March 6, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Randall and Angier, Gray's inn place, solicitors for the petitioners.

Hastings Sewage Manure Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated March 7, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Carr and Co, solicitors for the petitioners.

Kansas Mining Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before June 24, to send their Christian and surnames and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Wilson, Bartholomew house, Bartholomew lane. Wednesday, July 8 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Tumacacuri Mining and Land Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Feb 27, it was ordered that the above com-

pany be wound up. Manning, Great George st, Westminster, solicitor for the petitioner.

FRIDAY, March 6, 1874.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Chesterton Miners' Public Hall Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 28, directed to be heard before the M.R. on March 14. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle st, agents for Hillhousead, Tunstall, solicitor for the petitioners.

Colonial and Foreign Meat Supply Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 28, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 13. Gant, Walbrook, solicitor for the petitioners.

Leeds and Yorkshire Shoddy, Manure, and Superphosphate Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins dated Feb 27, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Singleton and Tattershall, Great James st, Bedford row, agents for Fawcett and Malcolm, Leeds, solicitors for the petitioners.

Stadli Flord Reclamation Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated Feb 12, appointed Thomas St. Leger Alcock, Green st, Grosvenor square, and Anders Westenhelm, Great Tower st, to be official liquidators.

Wine and Spirit Co-operative Supply Association, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed March 16 at 1.30, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1874.

Old Castle Friendly Society, Bruton, Somerset. March 6

Widow and Orphans' Friendly Society, Angelinn, Bowdley, Worcester. March 5

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Shipton Friendly Society, Crown inn, Shipton-under-Wychwood, Oxford. March 4

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Brooks, Richard, Cambridge Mews, Paddington, Shoeing Smith. March 30. Brooks v Davies, V.C. Hall. Poncione, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn.

Brooks, Sophia Margaret, Cambridge Mews, Paddington March 30. Brooks v Davies, V.C. Hall. Poncione, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn.

Chuter, Charles Swann, Houslow, Middlesex, Builder. April 6. Chuter v Chuter, M.R. Pyke, Lincoln's inn fields.

Crispin, Francisco Joze Cortes, Faro, Portugal. May 13. Crispin v Doghoni, V.C. Baco.

Jones, William, Cheshire, Builder. April 13. Jones v Jones, V.C. Malins. Walker and Smyth, Chester.

Land, John, Cannon st, House Decorator. April 11. Land v Land, M.R. Terry, King st, Cheapside.

Rooke, William Ashby, Boston Park rd, Brentford. April 6. Hill v Tate, V.C. Malins. May, Russell square.

Warner, Henry, Damerham, Wilts, Gent. April 15. Warner v Warner, V.C. Hall. Cole, Portico.

Webster, John, Manchester, Solicitor. April 6. Healey v Webster, V.C. Malins. Carpenter, Elm court, Temple.

Whitley, Mary, Chorley, Cheshire. April 13. European Assurance Society v Lee, M.R. Edwards, Manchester.

Mason, John, Bournemouth, Southampton, Chemist. April 6. Mason v Wilson, M.R. Mann, Hastings.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1874.

Gentry, James, Washbrook, Suffolk, Farmer. April 7. Birch v Gentry, V.C. Hall. Pollard, Ipswich.

Pudge, William, Castle Froome, Hereford, Butcher. April 2. Pudge v Pudge, V.C. Malins. Garroll, Hereford.

Symonds, Edward, St James' rd, Victoria Park, Gent. April 10. Symonds v Symonds, V.C. Malins. Harris, Moorgate st.

Waters, George, Emerald Hill, Victoria, Australia, Coachbuilder. Sept 30. McLean v Thomas, V.C. Hall. Parry, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, March 6, 1874.

Alderson, Rev Edmund, Aslackby, Lincoln. April 15. Oldman, Gainsborough.

Banister, Catherine, Antony West, Cornwall. April 14. Piper, Ledbury.

Brothers, Mary, Deptford, Kent. April 1. Williams and James, Lincoln's inn fields.

Cork, Henry Manley, Plympton Saint Mary, Devon, Yeoman. April 5. Fridham and Co, Plymouth.

Eden, Sir William, Windstone, Durham, Baronet. May 1. Watkins and Co, Sackville st, Piccadilly.

Feldiner, George, Manchester, Stock Broker. April 3. Atkinson and Co, Manchester.

Fox, Mary, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham. May 2. Pratt and Hodgkinson, Newark-upon-Trent.

Friend, George, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex. April 15. Johnson and Coote, Wardrobe place, Doctor's commons.

Galley, William, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Contractor. March 23. Merrills, Cardiff.

Gilbody, Abner, Salford, Lancashire, Labourer. March 16. Cobbett, and Co, Manchester.

Godwin, Richard Wilkey, Oxtou, Chester, Gent. March 31. Goffey, Liverpool.

Grievs, Richard, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gent. May 1. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Hall, Smith, Southport, Lancashire, Esq. April 7. Welsby and Hill, Southport.

Hodge, Catherine, Taunton, Somerset. April 26. Rawle, Bedford row.

Holloway, Jane, Wallington, Surrey, Mattress Manufacturer. April 10. Murray, Whitehall place.

Johnson, John, Altrincham, Chester, Timber Merchant. April 10. Fowden, Altrincham.

Jones, Richard, Montgomery, Aberhasep. April 10. Woosnam and Talbot, Newtown.

Lampen, John, Plymouth, Devon, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 1. Glibard and Hitchins, Devonport.

Mackinder, Elizabeth, Boston, Lincoln. April 1. Wise and Harwood, Boston.

Maxwell, John Balfour, Great Malvern, Worcester, Admiral. March 8. Roberts, Goddman st, Doctor's commons.

North, Charles, Chesterfield, Derby, High Bailiff. June 30. Wake, Sheffield.

Orr, Robert, Bedford park, Croydon, Esq. April 11. Rowland, Croydon.

Robins, Thomas, Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucester, Innkeeper. May 1. Dauncey and Turner, Wotton-under-Edge.

Smith, Charles Frederick, Cheetham, Lancashire, Merchant. April 8. Atkinson and Co, Manchester.

Tollman, Thomas, Ealing, no occupation. April 15. Shaen and Co, Bedford row.

Topham, George, Manchester, Whitesmith. April 6. Bond and Son, Manchester.

Turner, Thomas, Plas Bretonen, Carnarvon, Esq. May 1. Dauncey and Turner, Wotton-under-Edge.

Williams, Sarah, Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucester. May 1. Dauncey and Turner, Wotton-under-Edge.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Blandy, William, Westwood, Berks, Banker. May 1. Blandy, Reading.

Booth, John, Mansfield Woodhouse, Nottingham, Farmer. April 2. Bryan, Mansfield.

Borman, Josiah, Aberdeen park, Highbury, Emery Manufacturer. May 4. Carter, Assia Friars.

Cearns, Edward Paton, Beckenham, Kent, Solicitor. May 10. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st.

Child, John, Roch, Pemroke, Farmer. May 1. Mathias and Co, Haverfordwest.

Cordeux, Samuel, Camden square, Camden Town, Gent. April 7. Bastard, Brabant Court.

Courthope, George Kay, Knowle rd, Brixton. May 6. Brooks, Chantrey rd, Stockwell rd.

Cox, Robert, Bristol, Butcher. April 20. Bittan and Sons, Bristol.

Garroll, Richard Osborne, Little Dewchurch, Hereford, Gent. May 1. Garroll, Hereford.

Hill, Henry, Richmond, Surrey, Esq. May 1. Trollope and Winckworth, Abingdon st, Westminster.

Johnson, Elizabeth, Sharrow, York. April 2. Yewdall & Co, Bradford.

Johnson, Robert, Buckhurst hill, Essex, Timber Merchant. May 3. Russell, Coleman st.

Leffer, Frederick, Reading, Berks, Gent. May 30. Blandy, Reading.

Ludlow, John Thomas, Compton Greenfield, Gloucester, Clerk. April 6. Cooke and Sons, Bristol.

Luer, Charles Augustus, William, Strand, Coal Merchant. April 11. Rose-Innes, Fenchurch st.

Lunnas, James, Halesworth, Suffolk, Yeoman. April 4. Cross and Rem, Llewellyn.

Moseley, Frederick George, Sliechester rd, Notting hill, Licensed Victualler. April 13. Mason, Newgate st.

Norris, William, Anglesey, Southampton, Captain. April 30. Oliver and Sons, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

Paul, Loevis Nash Mary. June 1. Woolcombe and Co, Devonport.

Poncia, John, Edgbaston, Warwick, Merchant. April 30. Sandts and Smith, Birmingham.

Prebble, John Louis, Harpur st, Poplar, Officer Mercantile Marine. April 13. Mason, Newgate st.

Ramden, Sarah, Rye, Sussex. April 14. Dawes, Rye.

Rollison, John, Bloxwich, Stafford, Blacksmith. April 14. Baker, Walsall.

Ryde, Harriet, Glenbourne, West End, Hants. April 30. Green and Mobley, Southampton.

Scarr, Elizabeth, York. March 20. Holby, York.

Sperling, Henry John Sperling Nugent, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. April 15. Burton and Co, Chancery lane.

Stace, Elizabeth, Melcombe Regis, Dorset, Schoolmistress. May 1. Philips and Sidgwick, Gresham st.

Stevens, Thomas, Waghorne, Winter Hill, Berks, Farmer. June 6. Brown, Maidenhead.

Stewart, John, Norwich, Nurseryman. April 1. Taylor and Sons, Norwich.

Thompson, William George, Dalston-terrace, Dalston, Gent. April 25. Satchell and Chapple, Queen st, Cheapside.

Tollman, Thomas, South villas, Ealing, no occupation. April 15. Shaen and Co, Bedford row.

Vache, Marie Madeline, Somerset st, Portman square. April 3. Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane, Cheap-side.

White, Mary, Exeter. April 23. Bremridge, Exeter.

Young, George, Vale Royal, York rd, King's Cross, Shopkeeper. April 10. Drake and Son, Cloak lane, Cannon st.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1874.

Akerman, Thomas, Wick, Rissington, Gloucester, Farmer. May 6. Francis, Stow-on-the-Wold.

Axon, Samuel, Withington, Lancashire, Blacksmith. April 13. Howarth, Manchester.

Bagshaw, Charles, Sheffield, Ballder. April 6. Taylor, Sheffield.

Barnett, William, Birmingham, Ale and Wine Dealer. May 13. Cottrell, Birmingham.

Beestlane, Maria, Cheltenham, Gloucester. March 31. Hughes, Worcester.

Bishop, Anthony Crutenden, Gusselling, Sussex, Gent. May 7. Meadows and Elliott, Hastings.

Blockley, Thomas, Aylestone, Leicester, Farmer. April 23. Watson and Baxter, Lutterworth.

Blunt, Robert, New Windsor, Berks, Saddler. April 18. Moynell and Fenbourn, Whitehall place, Westminster.

Briston, Samuel Swann, Sheffield, Gent. April 25. Bramley, Sheffield.

Brodley, Richard, Bromley, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Marsh, Fen court, Fenchurch st.

Carrington, Thomas, Chesterfield, Derby, Coal and Iron Master. April 30. Burdick and Co, Sheffield
 Charrington, Frederick, Mile End, Brewer, April 30. Loxley and Morley, Cheapside
 Chickstar, Edmund Frideaux, Chertsey, Surrey, Captain. April 21. Frere and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Cobb, William, Margate, Kent, Esq. April 11. Tatham and Co, Frederick's place, Old Jewry
 Cockshott, Joseph, Sale, Chester, out of business. May 1. Chapman and Co, Manchester
 Cole, Robert, Cambridge, Pawnbroker. June 10. Whitehead, Cambridge
 Davies, John, Glanaber, Denbigh, Esq. May 1. Gold and Co, Denbigh
 Elliott, Sir Daniel, The Boltons, West Brompton. April 22. Forbes, Bedford row
 Elliott, Dame Georgina, The Boltons, West Brompton. April 22. Forbes, Bedford row
 Fowler, Willingham, Harrogate, York, High Bailiff. March 21. Hobson, Dewsbury
 Goe, Henry, John Anthony, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. May 11. Russell, Coleman st
 Griffiths, Samuel, Argoed Farm, Overton, Flint, Farmer. May 10. Griffiths, Argoed, Overton
 Hill, Thomas William, Clifton, Bristol, Gent. May 1. Brittan and Co, Bristol
 Hobson, Esther Reade, Onslow square. April 20. Tylee and Co, Essex st, Strand
 James, Thomas, Sheffield, Cowkeeper. April 10. Taylor, Sheffield
 Jennings, Thomas, Everton, Lancashire, Baker. May 1. Deane, Liverpool
 Johnson, John, Altrincham, Chester, Timber Merchant. April 30. Fowden, Altrincham
 Jones, John, Bristol, Gent. May 1. Brittan and Co, Bristol
 Juggins, William, Wallington, Surrey, Gent. June 15. Heron, Ely place, Holborn
 Logan, John, Bath, Contractor. May 14. Llewellyn, Newport
 Painter, Thomas, Uxmoor Farm, Ipsden, Oxford, Farmer. May 1. Crowdy and Son, Faringdon
 Payne, Charles Henry, Shirland rd, Malda Vale, Doctor. May 1. Rhodes and Son, Chancery lane
 Pugs, Julia, Maria Morton, Freshford, Somerset. May 1. Andrew and Atkins, George yard, Lombard st
 Philps, Henry Richard Bennett, Sparaholt, Barks, Farmer. April 23. Ray Oswald Joseph Reichel, Sparaholt Vicarage, near Wantage
 Pickering, Samuel, Kinterton-cum-Holme, near Middlewich, Farmer. June 3. Cooke, Middlewich
 Powditch, Mary, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk. March 25. Palmer, Great Yarmouth
 Read, Mary, Leeds. April 11. Middleton and Son, Leeds
 Rock, Edward, Wood Green, Middlesex, Cowkeeper. April 14. Martineau and Reid, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
 Scott, Jane, Manchester. June 15. Storer, Manchester
 Sibley, Emma, Nottingham. March 31. Acton, Nottingham
 Smith, Sir Francis Pettit, Thurloe place, South Kensington. April 10. Pamphilon, John st, Adelphi
 Tomlinson, John, Wednesbury, Stafford, Builder. May 11. Thursfield, Wednesbury
 Underhill, James, Liverpool, Accountant. March 31. Richardson, and Co, Liverpool
 Wheatman, John, Sheffield, Merchant. May 14. Vickers and Son, Sheffield
 Wollen, Jonathan, Heeley, Sheffield, Gent. April 25. Bramley, Sheffield
 Wyndham, George, Dulwood, New South Wales, Esq. May 1. Bothamleys and Freeman, Queen st, Cheapside

TUESDAY, March 17, 1874.
 Abraham, John, Ryde, Gent. April 30. Eldridge, Newport
 Allen, William, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Merchant. May 15. Ensor, Cardiff
 Attwater, James Thomas, Mile Town, Sheerness, Kent, Gent. April 21. Crose, Bell yard, Doctors' commons
 Argyll, Anne Duchess, Dowager of Rutland gate, Hyde park, May 1. Few and Co, Henrietta st, Covent garden
 Earing, Thomas, Bishopsgate at Within, Esq. May 30. Markby and Co, Coleman st
 Birch, Rev Edward Mounant, Kirby Moorside, York. May 12. Gray, York
 Cartwright, Joseph, Huddersfield, York, Woollensman. April 25. Brook and Co, Huddersfield
 Davis, Edwin Millard, Molt, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. April 18. Stone and Sparks, Bradford-on-Avon
 Elliott, Andrew, Bainsall Heath, near Birmingham, Gent. May 1. Dimbleby, Birmingham
 Garrett, William Henry, Apsley rd, South Norwood. April 30. Tyler, Liverpool rd, Islington
 Grandon, William, Leicester, Tanner. June 24. Dalton and Salisbury, Leicester
 Henley, Sarah Frances, Clifton, Bristol. April 12. Surman and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Holroyd, John, Pondleton, Lancashire, Shopkeeper. March 25. Grundy and Kershaw, Manchester
 Kingston, John Henry, The Grove, Boltons, South Kensington. June 30. Rawlinson, Clipping Norton
 Langlands, David, Old Windsor, Berks. Civil Engineer. April 10. Fritchard and Sons, Knight Rider st, Doctor's Commons
 Lawler, John Fletcher, Warburton, Chester, Gent. March 25. Grundy and Kershaw, Manchester
 Lamb, James, Woodcock, Wilts, Gent. May 30. Chapman and Ponting, Warminster
 Millicap, David, Farnham, Surrey, Pottery Merchant. April 18. Hollet and Mason, Farnham
 Morgan, William, sen, Chisford, Gloucester, Stonemason. May 14. Bretherton, Gloucester
 Parker, Rev Edwin James, Vicar of Waltham St Lawrence, Berks, April 30. Oliver and Sons, Carey st

Folden, William, Portsea, Southampton, Licensed Victualler. April 15. Edgcombe and Cole, Portsea
 Pole, Edward Sacherell, Chandos, Radburne Hall, near Derby, Esq. April 30. Gregory and Co, Bedford row
 Raynsford, Henrietta Charlotte, Kepple st, Bloomsbury. April 22. Tweedie, Lincoln's inn fields
 Stanton, William, Acaia rd, St John's Wood, Commission Agent. April 30. Shearman, Gresham st
 Summer, William, Sparkbrook, near Birmingham, Hop Dealer. April 23. Sole and Co, Aldermanbury
 Tanner, Charles William, Forest Gate, Essex, Coal Merchant. May 1. Hileary, Fenchurch buildings
 Tidswell, Joseph, sen, Leeds, Grocer. June 18. Barr and Co, Leeds
 Years, William, Lutterworth, Leicester, Innskeeper. May 15. Watson and Baxter, Lutterworth
 Ward, Thomas, Melton Mowbray, Leicester. May 1. Clarke, Melton Mowbray
 Whittington, Adelaide Sarah Skrine, Weymouth st, Portland place. May 1. Smith, Farnival's inn
 Yorath, William Gaiward, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Solicitor. May 15. Waldron, Cardiff

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Courtney, G C O, St James's place, no trade. Pet March 5. Pepsy. March 24 at 11
 Foulkes, Thomas, Fenchurch st, Merchant. Pet March 6. Murray. March 24 at 11
 Holland, William, South st, Finsbury, Merchant. Pet March 5. Pepsy. March 26 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Broady, Alfred, Altrincham, Cheshire, Grocer. Pet March 5. Kay. Manchester, March 26 at 9.30
 Clarke, Charles Leigh, Manchester. Iron Merchant. Pet March 6. Kay. Manchester, March 26 at 9.30
 Elliott, William Cornish, Balham, Surrey, Builder. Pet March 3. Willoughby. Wandsworth, March 20 at 11
 Lodge, Benjamin, Batley, Yorkshire, Plumber. Pet March 5. Nelson Dewsbury, March 26 at 3
 Martyn, Silas, Tredinnick, Cornwall, Farmer. Pet March 4. Chilcott. Truro, March 21 at 11.30
 Page, Walter Richard, Rugby Warwick, Boot Maker. Pet March 5. Kirby. Coventry, March 24 at 12

FRIDAY, March 13, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Douglas, John, Tottenham court rd, Upholsterer. Pet March 13. Murray. March 31 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Colver, Edward, Danton Green, Sevenoaks, Kent, Gent. Pet March 10. Cripps. Tunbridge Wells, April 1 at 12
 Evans, John Owen, Englefield, Berks, out of business. Pet March 14. Collins. Reading, April 2 at 11
 Griffiths, Mary Stepin, Pembroke, Farmer. Pet March 14. Lloyd. Carmarthen, March 27 at 11
 Smith, Samuel, Jun, Upton Snodsbury, Worcester, Gent. Pet March 14. Crisp. Worcester, April 2 at 12
 Wadley, George, Sutterton Dowdyke, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet March 13. Staniland. Boston, March 31 at 12.30

BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Brown, Hercules, Smethwick, Stafford, Miller. Feb 27

Liquidation by Arrangement. FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1874.

Abbott, Richard, Lime st, Merchant. March 23 at 2 at office of Barnett, New Broad st
 Adams, Joseph, Stewart's lane, Battersea Park, Corn Chandler. March 23 at 11 at 6, Argyll st, Regent st
 Baldry, George William, King st, Cheapside, Artist. March 18 at 11 at offices of Hunter, London wall
 Bentley, Stephen, Tunstall, Stafford, Grocer. March 20 at 11 at the Sneyd's Arms Hotel, Tunstall. Hollinshead, Tunstall
 Bond, Hartley, Eltham, Kent, Tailor. March 18 at 3 at offices of Seard and Son, Gracechurch st
 Boxall, Arthur, Preston, Sussex, Butcher. March 26 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Slip st, Brighton
 Bradshaw, Joseph, Winchester, Hants, Bearshop Keeper. March 21 at 3 at the Market Inn, Winchester. Kilby, Southampton
 Brenner, Philip, Westow st, Upper Norwood, Tailor. March 23 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane
 Busler, Charles, Carriehoe, York, Cattle Dealer. March 23 at 2 at offices of Teale and Son, Bedale
 Call, James, Leeds, Wine Merchant. March 19 at 2 at offices of Simpson and Barrell, Albion st, Leeds
 Child, Henry, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Tin Plate Worker. March 25 at 11.30 at office of Harrison, Horninlow st, Burton-upon-Trent
 Drenery, Burton-upon-Trent
 Clemence, Thomas, Salford, Flint, Grocer. March 24 at 12 at offices of Royell and Co, Pepper st, Chester
 Coffin, Alfred, Old Bethnal Green rd, Wood Turner. March 19 at 10 at office of Lewis, Chancery lane. Long, Blackfriars rd
 Cope, Ann, Tattenhall, Stafford, Baker. April 2 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Coultery, Thomas, and Thomas William Couldery, Wood st, Clothiers. March 20 at 3 at offices of Butcher, Cheapside
 Cowtan, Alfred, and John Cowtan, Ipswich, Suffolk, Grocers. March 24 at 11 at office of Watts, Butter market, Ipswich

- Crippen, William, Canterbury, Greengrocer. April 1 at 11 at the Fountain Hotel, Canterbury. Gibson, Sittingbourne Crossdale, William, Manchester, Hat Manufacturer. March 24 at 2 at offices of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester
- Dale, William Henry, York, Boot Dealer. March 23 at 3 at offices of Wilkinson, St Helen's square
- Daniel, Thomas, Plough rd, Rotherhithe, Builder. April 1 at 2 at office of Haynes, Chancery lane
- Dauncey, Frederick, Milverton, Somerset, Wine Merchant. March 27 at 1 at offices of Taunton, Bath place, Taunton
- Davies, John, Maesteg, Glamorgan, Draper. March 23 at 12 at offices of Stockwood, Jun, Bridgend
- Dawson, John, Deighton, York. March 21 at 11 at 1, Market walk, Huddersfield. Sykes and Son
- Dennis, Joseph, Parkside, Knightsbridge, Tailor. March 19 at 3 at office of Coker, Cheapside. Netherlands
- Edmonds, John Frederick, Birmingham, Baker. March 23 at 11 at offices of Duke, Christ Church passage, Birmingham
- Ellis, Edward Bourke, Bristol, Master Mariner. March 20 at 12 at offices of Pitt, Albion chambers East, Bristol
- Ely, Joseph George, Portland rd, Notting Hill, out of employment. March 19 at 3 at office of Watson, Basinghall st
- Evans, Levi, Walsall, Stafford, Innkeeper. March 24 at 11 at office of Bill, Bridge st, Walsall
- Farr, John, Redditch, Worcester, Umbrella Rib Maker. March 23 at 3 at offices of Walford, Waterloo st, Birmingham
- Fisher, John, Oselet, York, Tailor. March 26 at 11 at office of Stringer, Oselet
- Gowing, George Sead, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fish Merchant. March 27 at 12 at offices of Blake, Hall Quay, Great Yarmouth. Moseley, Great Yarmouth
- Hammond, Thomas, Bagshot, Surrey, Grocer. March 21 at 3 at offices of Geach, Guildford
- Harper, Thomas Joseph, Birmingham, Hairdresser. March 21 at 11 at offices of Maher and Poncia, Temple st, Birmingham
- Harrop, George, Longton, Stafford, Baker. March 19 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
- Haywood, John, Barham, Kent, Butcher. March 23 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Folkestone. Minter, Folkestone
- Hellaby, Richard Douglas, George Henry Child, and Charles Edward Hellaby, Cheapside, Tie Manufacturers. March 23 at 11 at 145, Cheapside. Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane
- Hitchen, Benjamin John, Radstock, Somerset, Draper. March 23 at 12 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Simmons and Clark, Bath
- Holbrook, Edward Randall, Abdon rd, Stoke Newington, Baker. March 23 at 3 at offices of Heathfield, Lincoln's inn fields
- Horder, George, Salford, Lancashire, Cook. March 20 at 3 at offices of Rideal and Shaw, Brzenescoe st, Manchester
- Hoyle, Squire, Salford, Lancashire, Grocer. March 19 at 2 at offices of Myers, Kennedy st, Manchester
- Ingate, Isabella Maria, Ilfracombe, Devon. March 23 at 3 at the Royal Clarence Hotel, Ilfracombe. Langdon
- Johnston, Matthew, Salford, Lancashire, Glass Dealer. March 23 at 11 at offices of Blair, St James's square, Manchester
- Kimber, George, Henry, Clopslain, near Horndean, Hants, Market Gardener. March 23 at 3 at offices of Blake, Union st, Portsmouth
- King, Charles, Sudbury, Suffolk, Boot Maker. March 18 at 2 at the Rose and Crown Hotel, Sudbury. Mumford, Sudbury
- Kisson, Edward John, Worcester, Chemist. March 25 at 11 at offices of Bea and Miller, Broad st, Worcester
- Lane, Charles Leveson, Pall Mall, Club Proprietor. March 27 at 12 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Nassau's avenue, Coleman st. Preston, Mark lane
- Langworthy, John Gray, Jamaica rd, Bermondsey, Draper. March 23 at 3 at offices of Sturt, Ironmonger lane
- Lewis, Edward Colston, Exeter, Hatier's Assistant. March 24 at 11 at the Castle Hotel, North st, Taunton. White, Exeter
- Lincoln, John, Winchester, Hants, Pensioner. March 21 at 2 at the Market Inn, Winchester. Kilby, Southampton
- Major, Thomas, Bristol, Baker. March 23 at 11 at offices of Ward, Broad st, Bristol
- Merrick, William, Jun, Stone, Stafford, Joiner. March 19 at 3 at the Vine Hotel, Stafford. Tennant, Hanley
- Moore, James Robert, Anerley hill, Surrey, Builder. March 20 at 2 at offices of Blackford and Riches, Great Swan alley, Moorgate st
- Murphy, John, Waverley, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. March 24 at 2 at offices of Hore and Monkhouse, Lord st, Liverpool
- Nash, William, Upper Saltley, near Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. March 24 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham
- Parry, John, Enfield rd, South, Kingsland rd, Actor. March 27 at 3 at offices of Brighton, Bishopsgate st Without
- Pearson, Leonard, Corbridge, Northumberland, Grocer. March 25 at 11 at offices of Bely, Hexham
- Phillips, William, James, Rye-hill-park, Peckham Rye, Clerk. March 25 at 3 at offices of Carr, Road lane
- Pimley, Thomas, Preston, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. March 25 at 11 at offices of Forshaw, Cannon st, Preston
- Pleace, James Jollop, Weston-super-Mare, Brewer. March 26 at 12 at offices of Reed and Cook, King's square, Bridgewater
- Pope, John George, Marlborough, Wilts, Builder. March 20 at 11 at offices of Day, St John st, Devizes
- Richards, Benjamin, Wednesbury, Stafford, Lines Draper. March 24 at 11 at offices of Smith, Walsall rd, Wednesbury
- Richardson, George, Dewsbury, York, Draper. March 23 at 3 at office of Ibberson, Dewsbury
- Ringrose, Walter, Roman rd, Victoria Park, Tailor. March 31 at 10 at offices of Steadman, Coleman st
- Roberts, Edward, Bridgnorth, Salop, Innkeeper. March 18 at 3 at offices of Willcock, Queens's chambers, North st, Wolverhampton
- Rollinson, William, Knarsborough, York, Builder. March 23 at 12 at offices of Kirby and Son, Knarsborough
- Seaton, Phillip, York, out of business. March 24 at 11 at offices of Mann and Son, New st, York
- Stone, Edward, Leatherhead, Surrey, Brewer. March 20 at 1 at the Guildhall Coffee house. Clabon and Fearon, Great George st, Westminster
- Taylor, Thomas Moulding, Marlborough, Wilts, Engineer. March 23 at 2 at the Great Western Hotel, Reading. Lucas, Newbury
- Thomas, David, and Tom Skelton Nash, Neath, Glamorgan, Common Brewers. March 19 at 2 at offices of Britain and Co, Small st, Bristol. Curtis, Neath
- Thorne, James, High st, Woolwich, out of business. March 19 at 3 at Cooper, Chancery lane
- Tippet, Wellington Peter, Bristol, Beer Retailer. March 24 at 13 at offices of Henderson, Broad st, Bristol
- Triptree, James, Yeovil, Somerset, Glover. March 25 at 11 at the Mermaid Hotel, High st, Yeovil. Glyde, Yeovil
- Tuck, Edward, and William Stoneham Pike, Bath, Ironmongers. March 21 at 1, at offices of Wilton, Westgate-buildings, Bath
- Turnley, Joseph, Wilkison st, Albert square, Clapham, Gent. March 30 at 13 at offices of Sykes, St Swithin's lane
- Upton, Joseph, Billerica, Essex, Harness Maker. March 26 at 2 at offices of Woodard, Ingram court, Fenchurch st
- Upton, George Richard, Brighton, Sussex, Beerhouse Keeper. March 18 at 4.30 at offices of Howell, Cheapside
- Venables, Joseph, Maidenhead, Berks, Blacksmith. March 28 at 3 at 19, Queen st, Maidenhead. Clarke, High Wycombe
- Walker, William, Burslem, Stafford, Yeast Dealer. March 18 at 1 at offices of Lees, Burslem
- Wall, John, St Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex, Boot Maker. March 20 at 12 at offices of Miller and Miller, Sherborne lane. Savery, Hastings
- Wall, Simon, Northampton, Draper. March 21 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Northampton. Boys, Banet
- Ward, William, Redhill, Surrey, Grocer. March 19 at 3 at offices of Bath and Co, King William st
- Weaver, John Frederick, Wardour st, Dealer in Curiosities. March 19 at 2 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st
- Woodcock, Rev Frederic Edward, Stony Stratford, Buckingham. March 24 at 11 at offices of Jessop, Harpur st, Bedford
- Woodcock, John, Deal, Kent, Ironmonger. March 30 at 11 at 98, Middle st, Deal. Drew
- Wunderlich, Max, Englefield rd, Kingland, Commission Agent. March 19 at 2 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st
- PAIDAY, March 13, 1874.**
- Boon, Ebenezer, and William Hambridge, Yeovil, Somerset, Tailors. March 28 at 12 at the George Hotel, Trowbridge
- Bowden, John, Ipplepen, Devon, Merchant. March 21 (and not 14 as erroneously printed in Gazette of March 6) at 3.30 at the Half Moon Hotel, Exeter. Leary and Leary, South st, Finsbury
- Boyes, John, Haverhill, York, Boot Dealer. March 24 at 3 at office of Wans, Haverhill, Scarborough
- Brown, John, Dewsbury, York, Cloth Finisher. March 26 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury. Walker, Dewsbury
- Bunkell, Henry Christopher, King st, Cheapside, Auctioneer. March 26 at 4 at offices of Challis, Clement's lane. Watson, Basinghall st
- Cain, Charles, Linton, Bedford, Baker. March 24 at 2.30 at offices of Jeffery, King st, Luton
- Carr, George, Bread st, Commission Agent. March 26 at 2 at offices of Lovering and Co, Gresham st. Plunkett, Gutter lane
- Cella, Luigi, Boston, Lincoln, Photographic Artist. March 27 at 11 at the Peacock Hotel, Market place, Boston. York, Boston
- Chapman, Thomas, Sunderland, Durham, Upholsterer. March 25 at 11 at the Queens's Hotel, Leeds. Alcock, Jun, Sunderland
- Clewlow, Thomas, Upper Sydenham, Bootmaker. March 25 at 3 at 145, Cheapside. McDiarmid, Old Jewry chambers
- Cooper, Eliza Frances Henrietta, Pinhoe, Devon. March 28 at 12 at offices of Floud, Castle st, Exeter
- Crisfield, William Henry, Winchester, Cattle Salesman. April 2 at 2 at offices of Edmonds and Davis, High st, Southampton. Loner
- Dakin, John, Lichfield, Stafford, Builder. March 26 at 11 at offices of Dugan and Co, Bridge, Walsall. Dale, Walsall
- Drake, Joe, Halifax, York, Card Maker. March 30 at 11 at 10, Cheapside, Halifax. Holroyde and Smith
- Drummond, William, Wrexham, Denbigh, Bookseller. March 27 at 12 at offices of Jones, Henblas st, Wrexham
- Ellis, Catherine Hartley, Dewsbury, York, Milliner. March 31 at 10.15 at offices of Scholes and Son, Leeds rd, Dewsbury
- Faehnlén, Emil, Noble st, Warehouseman. March 26 at 3 at offices of Davies, Farnival's lane
- Gerthwohl, Benedict Sigmund, Postern row, Trinity square, Wine Merchant. April 8 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st
- Miller, King st, Cheapside
- Gibb, George, Shrewsbury, Salop, Tobaccoist. March 26 at 11 at offices of Morris, Swan hill, Shrewsbury
- Goff, Robert, New Windsor, Berks, Grocer. March 25 at 3 at offices of Durant, Guildhall chambers
- Hancock, Robert Andrew, Winscombe, Somerset, Beer Retailer. March 25 at 3 at offices of Webster, Axbridge
- Harraird, William, Norwich, Grocer. March 24 at 12 at offices of the Registrar of the County Court, Redwell st, Norwich
- Harrison, Thomas, Birmingham, Lamp Dealer. March 25 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham
- Hellaby, Richard Douglas, George Henry Child, and Charles Edward Hellaby, Cheapside, Tie Manufacturers. March 23 at 11.15 at 145, Cheapside. Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane
- Hill, Peter, Newport, Isle of Wight, Draper. March 25 at 11 at 56, Bartholomew close. Joyce
- Hollings, Elizabeth, Idle, York, Grocer. March 26 at 3 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrral st, Bradford
- Hunter, Samuel Henry, Birmingham, Hair Dresser. March 24 at 11 at offices of Pointon, Edmund st, Birmingham
- Hurst, John, Bolton-le-Moors, Lancashire, Grocer. April 2 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Sutton and Elliott, Manchester
- Huxter, Nathan, Stanningley, near Leeds, Millwright. March 25 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds
- Jenkins, Thomas, and William Jenkins, Becks, Carmarthen, Cheese Merchants. March 30 at 1 at the Ivy Bush Hotel, Carmarthen. Bishop, Landlode
- Johnson, Robert, Burr st, London Docks, out of business. April 9 at 3 at office of Beard, White Lion st, Norton Folgate
- Leonard, Henry, Bristol, Ironmonger. March 31 at 12 at offices of Lomas and Co, Cannon st, Birmingham. Thick, Bristol

Lloyd, Henry John, Birmingham, Glass Manufacturer. March 26 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson place, Birmingham. Fitter, Birmingham.

Lockyer, Elizabeth Sarah, Tenby, Pembroke, Bookseller. March 25 at 1 at offices of Lawcels, Narberth.

Martin, Freeman, Newport, Monmouth, Painter. March 30 at 12 at offices of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport.

Mess, Thomas, Wells, Somerset, Miller. March 30 at 1 at offices of Ames, Cheap st, Frome.

Mercer, George, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Builder. March 27 at 11 at offices of Barton, Bedford terrace, Tunbridge Wells.

Mussabini, Pierre, Liverpool, Cotton Broker. March 31 at 2 at offices of Radcliffe and Layton, Hackney, Hey, Dale st, Liverpool.

Nelson, Andrew, Rochdale, Lancashire, Journeyman Whitesmith. March 27 at 3 at 10, Nicholas st, Barnley. Hartley.

Nickels, William, Great College st, Camden Town, Pork Butcher. March 28 at 10 at the Wrotham Arms, Wrotham rd, Camden New Town. Hicks, Anna rd, South Hackney.

Osborn, Henry Edmund, Davenport, Northampton, Licensed Victualler. March 25 at 8 at offices of Potts, New st, Davenport.

Parker, John Wilson, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Tobacconist. March 25 at 2 at the Bath Hotel, Leamington Priors. Sanderson, Warwick.

Parks, Samuel, Hoxton st, Hoxton, Clothier. March 27 at 11 at 21, Pimlico walk, Hoxton. Goatly, Bow st.

Parry, David, North, Glamorgan, Builder. April 1 at 12 at offices of Leyson, James st, Neath.

Pearce, William, Manchester, Greengrocer. March 26 at 3 at office of Ritson, John Dalton st, Manchester.

Pearson, William, Penkridge, Stafford, Saddler. March 26 at 11 at office of Bowen, Martin st, St. Ford.

Perrin, Hannah and Samuel Perrin, Bredbury, Chester. Grocer. April 2 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring-gardens, Manchester. Duckworth, Manchester.

Polblank, Thomas Richard Jarvis, Mornington rd, Rosent's Park. Master Mariner. March 23 at 3 at the Masons' Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Watson, Basinghall st.

Potter, William, Liverpool st, Fruiterer. March 31 at 11 at offices of Preston, Mark lane.

Powell, Charles, Duke st, Lincoln's inn fields, Cheesemonger. April 2 at 2 at offices of Parry, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.

Pritchard, Edwin, Hampstead rd, Coal and Potato Dealer. March 23 at 3 at office of Button and Co, Henrietta st, Covent garden.

Price, William Henry, East Stone house, Derson, Messman. March 23 at 12 at office of Square, George st, Plymouth.

Richards, Evan, Liverpool, Draper. March 27 at 3 at office of Lawrence and Dixon, Harrington st, Liverpool.

Robertson, Samuel Boxill, New Inn, Strand, Solicitor. March 21 at 1 at 33, Gutter lane. Harroft, Falcon court, Fleet st.

Roper, John Henry and Jesse Cooke, Koughley, York, Machine Wool Combers. March 31 at 2.30 at office of Wright and Waterworth, Devonshire buildings, Keigley.

Simpkins, Thomas, Tunbridge Well, Kent, Ironmonger. March 26 at 2 at office of Tippett and Co, Great St Thomas Apostle.

Sise, Thomas Simpson, Bradford, York, Tailor. March 26 at 11 at office of Terry and Robinson. Market st, Bradford.

Smith, Joseph, Sowerby Bridge, York, Wool and Waste Dealer. March 25 at 11 at office of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax.

Sutton, George Frederick, Woodfield place, Harrow rd, Traveller. March 25 at 2 at office of Peddell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.

Sykes, Richard, Cambridge rd, Edgware rd, Boot and Shoe Dealer. March 27 at 12 at office of Barron, Queen st, Cannon st.

Tattersall, Richard, Hillwell, Lancashire, Carter. April 1 at 10 at office of Richardson, Wood st, Bolton.

Thomas, David and Tom Skeilton Nash, Neath, Glamorgan, Common Brewers. March 26 at 12.30 at office of Curtis, South terrace, Neath.

Thomas, George, Lawrence lane, Woolen, Warehouseman. March 26 at 12 at office of Plunkett, Gutter lane.

Thomas, James, Chalford, Gloucestershire, Grocer. March 26 (and not on the 16th day of March) at 11 at the Swan Inn, Stroud. Smith, Stroud.

Thomas, William, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Nurseryman. March 31 at 12 at office of Galls, Queen st, Wolverhampton.

Timms, Henry, Fulham rd, Tallor. March 25 at 2 at offices of Lawin, Southampton st, Strand.

Turnbly, David, The Terrace, Earl's Court rd, Kensington, Carpenter. March 23 at 2 at 6, Beaufort buildings, Strand. Lind.

Walton, James, West Gorton, near Manchester, Grocer. March 27 at 2 at offices of Adleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.

Wheeler, James Christian, High st, Fulham, Grocer. March 23 at 1 at offices of Izard and Betts, Eastcheap. Reed and Lovell, Basinghall st.

Whitlock, John, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. March 25 at 3.30 at the Queen's Hotel, Luton. Annesley, St Albans.

Wilkinson, John, Old Leake, Lincoln, Farmer. March 27 at 3 at the Angel Inn, Wrangle. Bell, Louth.

Williams, David, Carminefach, near Narberth, Pembroke, Agricultural Labourer. March 27 at 10.15 at offices of Parry, Pembroke Dock.

Williams, Peter Mostyn, Liverpool, Coal Merchant. March 31 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, Liverpool.

Wyatt, Richard, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwick, Tailor. March 25 at 12 at the Falcon Tavern, Chapel st, Stratford-upon-Avon. Lane.

Yussey, March 17, 1874.

Allen, John, Burton-upon-Trent, Derby. March 27 at 11.30 at offices of Harrison, Horninglow st, Burton-upon-Trent. Drowry, Burton-upon-Trent.

Allen, William, Great Stambridge, Essex, Farmer. March 31 at 2 at the King's Head Inn, Rochford. Gregson, Jun.

Anderson, William, East Moulsey, Surrey, Grocer. March 30 at 2 at offices of Bradley, Mark lane.

Atherton, Edward, Manchester, Lithographer. March 13 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester.

Austin, James Withers, Bristol, Grocer. March 25 at 11 at 1, Bristol chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol.

Back, John, Ashford, Kent, Baker. March 31 at 2 at offices of Hallett and Co, North st, Ashford.

Barber, Randall, Bandish, Merford, Foreman to a Farmer. March 30 at 3 at offices of Bailey, Union st, Luton.

Barrow, William, Sunderland, Durham, Joiner. April 2 at 11 at offices of Pinkey, John st, Sunderland.

Barton, Francis, Boston, O.b. Proprietor. March 28 at 11 at offices of Dyer, Church lane, Boston.

Biddle, George, Birmingham, Draper. March 31 at 8, York st, Manchester (in lieu of the place originally named).

Biswell, Samuel, Hackney rd, Old Man. March 31 at 3 at offices of Brunkill, Great James st, Bedford row.

Blowers, William, Carlton Colville, Suffolk, Plumber. March 31 at 12 at offices of Seago, High st, Lowestoft.

Bona, Evan, Mountain Ash, Glamorgan, Boot Maker. March 26 at 2 at offices of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare.

Bowden, William Henry, Lamb's Conduit st, Holborn, Carriage Manufacturer. March 31 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st.

Rixworthy, Lime st.

Brough, William Edward, Upper Sunbury, Middlesex, Clerk. March 30 at 2 at offices of Hudgett, Gresham st. Gray, Gresham st.

Brown, John, Redington, Northumberland, Grocer. March 30 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Bullivant, Thomas, Great Suffolk st, Southwark, Builder. March 27 at 3 at the Bridge house, Hotel, Broad High st, Southwark. Harris and Finch, Borough High st, Southwark.

Burrill, John, Manchester, Grocer. April 1 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.

Barton, Mary, Maidstone, Kent, Schoolmistress. March 30 at 3 at offices of Manney, King st, Maidstone.

Campbell, Edward, Rye, East Sussex, Eating house Keeper. March 27 at 3 at offices of Ibberson, Dewsbury.

Casari, Leopold, Cannonbury rd, Islington, Importer of Fancy Goods. March 30 at 3 at office of Holmes, Eastcheap.

Chapman, John, Southwold, Suffolk, Grocer. March 30 at 3 at offices of Pearce, Princes st, Ipswich. Hill, Ipswich.

Child, Stephen, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Carver. March 30 at 12 at offices of Smith, Grosvenor place, Cheltenham.

Cox, Joseph White, Winchester, no occupation. March 30 at 11 at offices of Woodridge and Son, Upper Brook, Winchester.

Crane, David, Birmingham, Tailor. March 30 at 3 at offices of Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st, Birmingham.

Davenport, John, Jun., and Augustine Beck, Jun. Hanley, Stafford, Earthenware Manufacturers. March 30 at 11 at the County Court Office, Chesapeake, Hanley.

Davis, Joseph, Bladon, Somerset, Butcher. March 31 at 3 at offices of Webster, Axbridge.

Donaghy, Hugh, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Innkeeper. April 7 at 12 at offices of After, New Lower st, Whitehaven.

Elliott, Frederick James, St George's circus, Backfriars rd, Printer. April 2 at 2 at offices of Layton, Suffolk lane, Cannon st.

Faulkner, John, Boston, Lincoln, Brewer. March 28 at 12 at offices of Thomas, Emery lane, Boston.

Foulkes, Edward, Carnarvon, Draper. March 30 at 2 at the Clarence Hotel, Manchester. Allanson, Carnarvon.

Goson, George, Southall, Middlesex, Builder. March 30 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Treuener and Wolferstan, Ironmonger lane, Chesapeake.

Gooch, Robert, High st, Borough, Licensed Victualler. March 27 at 11 at the King's Head, High st, Borough. Love, King William st.

Gregg, Charles, Birmingham, Dealer in Horses. March 25 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham.

Griffiths, Mary, Stapin, Pembrokeshire, Butter Merchant. March 27 at 10 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Howell, Llanelly.

Hallen, Thomas Hughes, Slough Farm, Monmouth, Farmer. April 7 at 11 at offices of Williams and Co, Dock st, Newport.

Hamilton, James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Draper. April 1 at 11 at offices of Indieward and Dargrey, Dean st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Hammond, Frederick, Isleworth, Middlesex, Wine Merchant. April 1 at 3 at the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery lane. Woodbridge and Sons, Clifford's Inn.

Hill, Samuel, Bethnal Green rd, Cabinet Manufacturer. March 24 at 12 at offices of Vickers, Southampton buildings, Holborn.

Hinchliffe, George, Hipperholme, Halifax, York, Machine Maker. March 30 at 12 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax.

Hipkins, David, and David Alexander Hipkins, Westbromwich, Stafford, Iron Masters. April 2 at 2 at the King's Head Inn, Worcester st, Birmingham. Warrington, Dudley.

Horlick, Alfred, Merton, Surrey, Farmer. March 27 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Lincoln's inn fields.

Hoy, William, Wood Green, Middlesex, Grocer. March 31 at 12 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st Within. Phillips, Gray's inn square.

Innocent, Francis, Birmingham, Draper. March 28 at 11 at offices of Marries, Waterloo st, Birmingham. Pointon, Birmingham.

Jacoby, John Edward, Euston rd, Bedding Manufacturer. March 21 at 3 at offices of Thwaite, Basinghall st. Fulcher, Basinghall st.

James, William, Birmingham, Gas Fitting Manufacturer. March 21 at 12 at the Hen and Chickens Hotel, New st, Birmingham.

Jones, John Morgan, Aberaman, Glamorgan, Boot and Shoe Maker. March 26 at 1 at office of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare.

Kay, James, Oldham, Lancashire, Confectioner. March 27 at 3 at office of Clew, Clew st, Oldham.

Keel, John, Ramsgate Kent, Builder. March 30 at 3 at 1, York st, Ramsgate. Edwards.

Kewell, George, Wilts, South Newton, out of business. April 2 at 3 at office of Cobb and Smith, The Canal, Salisbury.

Lander, George William, Drury lane, Clothier. March 30 at 2 at office of Lydbery and Co, Chesapeake. Clapham and Fitch, Bishopsgate Without.

Lines, John, Birmingham, Fish Salesman. March 28 at 11 at office of Lowe, Temple st, Birmingham.

Lloyd, Thomas Edwin, Garston, near Liverpool, Chemist. March 30 at 3 at office of Roose and Price, North John st, Liverpool.

Lomnitz, Edward James, Manchester, Merchant. April 2 at 1 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Sale and Co, Manchester.

Long, John Charles, Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, Grocer. March 31 at 1 at the Bugle Hotel, Yarmouth. Urry.

Mansfield, Henry, Farnham, Surrey, Gaiter Maker. April 2 at 2 at office of Eve, Oxford Villa, Victoria rd, Aldershot.

Mills, William Edward, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Corn Dealer. March 30 at 11 at office of Cheshyre, Regent st, Cheltenham.

Mitchell, Matilda, Cardiff, Boot and Shoe Maker. March 27 at 11 at 18, High st, Cardiff. Morgan

North, Benjamin, Huddersfield, York, Dry Soap Manufacturer. April 2 at 11 at office of Baker and Sons, E-tate buildings, Huddersfield

Owens, Benjamin, and Owen Owens, Chester. Builders. March 30 at 12 at the Queen Railway Hotel, Chester. Churton, Chester

Palmer, Isaac, Stockwell st, Greenwich, Upholsterer. March 31 at 3 at office of Briggs and Co, King st, Cheapside. Bristol

Payne, Levi, Bristol, Cab Proprietor. March 28 at 12 at office of Benson and Thomas, Broad st, Bristol

Popper, William, Ipswich, Suffolk, Carpenter. March 31 at 11 at office of Jennings, Falcon st, Ipswich

Pettit, Joseph, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Corn, Hay, and Straw Dealer. April 6 at 2 at office of Salmon and Son, Bury St Edmunds

Porter, James, Great Grimsby, Lincoln, Pilot. April 2 at 12 at Chapman's Hotel, Great Grimsby. Masson, Great Grimsby

Purkin, Charles William, Camden st, Camden town, Builder. April 9 at 3 at office of Holmes, Eastcheap

Ramsdon, Charles, Leeds, Machine Tool Maker. April 1 at 11 at office of Booth and Co, East parade, Leeds

Rauds, Elijah Lester, Kingston, Surrey, Ironmonger. March 28 at 11 at office of Robinson, Basinghall st

Renneck, John Sebastian Christie, Cornhill, Underwriter. March 31 at 11 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Iogle and Co, Threadneedle st

Reynolds, John, Redruth, Cornwall, Grocer. March 30 2.30 at office of Downing, Redruth. Dendy, Redruth

Richardson, Samuel, Birmingham, Schoolmaster. March 31 at 3 at office of Ansell, Temple st, Birmingham

Rogers, Noah, Trowbridge, Wilts, Quarrymaster. March 26 at 12 at the Court Hall, Trowbridge. Spackman

Ryder, Joseph, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Stafford, Butcher. March 28 at 11 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-upon-Trent. Cooper, Congleton

Sheldon, Alfred, Birmingham, Beer Retailer. March 28 at 11 at office of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Soffe, Richard Foster, Little Eastleigh, Southampton, Coal Merchant. March 27 at 1 at the Crown Hotel, High st, Southampton. Lee and Best, Winchester

Steads, Frederick Herbert, Birmingham, Factor. March 27 at 11 at office of Davies, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Thornton, Joseph, Idle, York, Grocer. March 28 at 11 at office of Wood and Killick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford

Taylor, George, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Baker. March 31 at 12 at office of Rayson, Regent st, Great Yarmouth

Tucker, Douglas Alexander, Lee st, Haggerstone, Grocer. March 26 at 10 at office of Lewis, Chancery lane. Long, Blackfriars rd

Tyer, Alfred, Dartford, Kent, Grocer. April 2 at 145, Cheapside. Stopher, Coleman at

Wade, Robert, Huddersfield, York, Grocer. April 1 at 11 at office of Sykes and Son, Market walk, Huddersfield

Waigh, Jane, Bristol, Lodging house Keeper. March 31 at 12 at office of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. King

Walden, Joseph Johnson, Southampton, Hosier. March 31 at 3 at office of Kilby, Portland st, Southampton

Ward, Henry Lea, Middlewich, Chester, Chemist. March 31 at 11 at office of Cooke, Middlewich

Ward, Samuel, Birmingham, Butcher. March 27 at 12 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

West, William, Ramsgate, Kent, Draper. March 30 at 3 at office of Sturt, Ironmonger lane

Willcocks, Isaac, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Victualler. March 28 at 12 at office of Hancock and Co, Broad st, Bristol. Clifton, Bristol

Wilson, John Atkinson, Alwrick, Northumberland, Gent. April 1 at 2 at the White Swan Hotel, Alwrick. Shum and Co

Womack, Elijah, Maccabrough, York, Cabinet Maker. March 31 at 11 at office of Wells, Church st, Metherham

Wood John, Birmingham, Provision Merchant. March 31 at 3 at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham. Walford

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 3 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

EDE AND SON, ROBE MAKERS.

By Special Appointment to HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, The Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELS' DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES.

UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON.

IMPROVED AND ECONOMIC COOKERY.—Use LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT as "stock" for soups, stews, made dishes and sauces; gives fine flavour and great strength. Invariably adopted in households when fairly tried. **CAUTION.**—Genuine only with Baron Liebig's facsimile across label.

1, QUEEN'S BUILDINGS, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., MANSION HOUSE.

TO BE LET, A Corner House, with a basement and sub-basement, suitable for Strong Rooms.—Apply to GEORGE LOW, Esq., 10, Basinghall-street, Architect; or to Messrs. ROBERT CHRISTIE & Co., on the premises.

TO SOLICITORS, Fire and Life Assurance Societies, Public Companies, and others. New Bridge-street Chambers.—To be LET, first-class suites of offices, on the first, second, and third floors of excellent newly-decorated premises. Also extensive cellars, with offices on basement.—Full particulars of Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER, 59, Cheapside.

LINCOLN'S INN CHAMBERS, 40, Chancery-lane.—Several Suites of Chambers, from 2 to 17 rooms, each with strong rooms, to be LET, in these fire-proof buildings, suitable for Barristers, Solicitors, or other professional gentlemen, at moderate rents, including all rates and taxes.—Apply to Mr. F. CHIFFERLIS, Law Stationer, 35, Curator-street, Chancery-lane; or to the Porter on the premises.

TO SOLICITORS AND CAPITALISTS.—Freehold Land to be SOLD, having frontages for about Forty Houses, in a good building locality, and close to a station on the Metropolitan Railway.

The Sewers have been put in throughout the whole of the property, and active building operations carried on to the present time. This is well worth the attention of Solicitors and of Gentlemen seeking investments, as it only requires a moderate amount of Capital to develop this land and create Freehold Ground rents.—For particulars, apply to PHILIP WILKINSON, Architect, &c., 151, Edgware-road, W.

ESTATES AND HOUSES to be SOLD or LET.—Messrs. VENTOM, BULL, & COOPER'S Monthly Register, containing full particulars of Estates and Farms, Furnished and Unfurnished Houses in town and country, Ground Rents and Investments generally, may be had free on application or by post for one stamp. Owners having properties for disposal are invited to send full particulars to the Auction and Estate Agency Offices, 8, Bucklersbury, E.C.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST OF ESTATES AND HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

No. 42, BEDFORD-ROW.

To Professional Men and others.

WILKINSON & HORNE will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on FRIDAY, the 27th MARCH, at ONE for TWO, by order of the Executors of the late Thomas Wormald, Esq., the valuable LEASE of the capital professional RESIDENCE, No. 42, Bedford-row, together with the stabling in the rear. Held from the Bedford Charity Estate for an unexpired term of 20 years, at a very moderate rental.

Particulars may be had of

Messrs. STEVENS, WILKINSON, & HARRIES, Solicitors, 4, Nicholas-lane, Lombard-street; and of the Auctioneers, 7, Poultry.

EDGWARE ROAD.

Freehold Ground-Rent of £120, with valuable reversion after 19 years.

MESSRS. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & Co. will SELL by AUCTION, on TUESDAY, MARCH 31, the very handsome FREEHOLD SHOP, known as 155, Edgware-road, having a frontage of 19 feet and a depth of 120 feet; occupied by Messrs. Garrould, the well-known drapers, leased for a term, of which 19 years are unexpired, at £120 a year, but worth a rental of several hundreds a year.

Particulars of

Messrs. MASTERMAN, HUGHES, MASTERMAN, & REW, Solicitors, No. 26, Austinfriars;

or of Messrs. PHILIP D. TUCKETT & Co., Land Agents and Surveyors, 108, Old Broad-street, E.C.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION BAKER-STREET.—Great Attractions.—The CARRIAGE used by NAPOLEON III. at Metz, Chalons, and Sedan, with numerous relics of the campaign of 1870. Portrait Models of MARSHAL'S BAZAINE and McMAHON, M. THIERS, FRANCIS JOSEPH of AUSTRIA, and the SHAH of PERSIA, with the original photograph and testimonial presented to Madame Tussaud and Sons, July 3rd, 1873, as a souvenir of His Imperial Majesty's visit, are now added; also, new superb and costly Court dresses. Admission, 1s. Children under ten, 6d. Extra rooms, 6d. Open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Travellers' Safety.—TWO new LECTURES—the first, SAFETY AT SEA (in which will be discussed the best method of lowering boats); the second, SAFETY ON LAND (in which railway matters will be discussed) will shortly follow. Mr. Howard Paul during the week. Jane Conquest. Sugar and the Silver Light, by Professor Gardiner. Domestic Electricity, Mr. King. Other entertainments. Open 12 and 7. Admission 1s.